VIDEOTAPE DEPOSITION OF TO	/ I V I			
	1		<u>I</u> <u>N</u> <u>D</u> <u>E</u> <u>X</u>	
	2	Witne	ss	Pages
UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT	3	TONY	J. VAN DER WIELEN	
UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT EASTERN DISTRICT OF WISCONSIN	4		Examination by Mr. Poland	7/110
	5			
ALVIN BALDUS, CINDY BARBERA, CARLENE BECHEN, RONALD BIENDSEIL,	3		Examination by Ms. Lazar	102
RON BOONE, VERÁ BOONE, ELVIRA BUMPUS, EVANJELINA CLEEREMAN, SHEILA COCHRAN,	6			
LESLIE W. DAVIS III, BRETT ECKSTEIN, MAXINE HOUGH, CLARENCE JOHNSON,	7			
RICHARD KRESBACH, RICHARD LANGE, GLADYS MANZANET, ROCHELLE MOORE,	١.			
AMY RISSEEUW, JUDY ROBSON, GLORIA ROGERS,	8			
JEANNE SANCHEZ-BELL, CECELIA SCHLIEPP, and TRAVIS THYSSEN,	9		$\underline{\mathtt{E}} \ \underline{\mathtt{X}} \ \underline{\mathtt{H}} \ \underline{\mathtt{I}} \ \underline{\mathtt{B}} \ \underline{\mathtt{I}} \ \underline{\mathtt{T}} \ \underline{\mathtt{S}}$	
Plaintiffs,	10	No.	Description Id	entified
TAMMY BALDWIN, GWENDOLYNNE MOORE,	11	145	Subpoena to Testify at a Deposition	
and RONALD KIND,			In a Civil Action	9
Intervenor-Plaintiffs,	12	146	Documents Produced in Response to	
v. File No. 11-CV-562	13		Subpoena Issued by Plaintiffs to	
Members of the Wisconsin Government	14		Tony J. Van Der Wielen Dated February 3rd, 2012	10
Accountability Board, each only in his official capacity:				
MICHAEL BRENNAN, DAVID DEININGER, GERALD NICHOL, THOMAS CANE,	15	147	Thumb drive containing documents in response to subpoena	14
THOMAS BARLAND, and TIMOTHY VOCKE,	16		response to subpoena	11
[Caption Continued]	17	148	Analysis of WISE-LR and Adjusted GAB datasets	2.4
VIDEOTAPE DEPOSITION	''		GAB datasets	2 4
TONY J. VAN DER WIELEN	18	149	Colored map	5 9
Madison, Wisconsin	19	150	Memorandum dated 1/3/12 to legislative	
February 7, 2012	20		Leaders from Steve Miller and Jeff Ylvisaker	70
Sarah Finley Pelletter, RPR Registered Professional Reporter	1 20		Jell livisaker	70
Registered in Oressional Reporter	21	151	Government Accountability Board	
	22		Redistricting Meeting, Questions for GAB Staff	72
	22	1.50	Warra dahad 1/02/10 manadina GDD	
	23	152	Memo dated 1/23/12 regarding GAB memorandum of 1/13/12	7 9
	24			
	25		(Continued)	
			3	
and KEVIN KENNEDY, Director and	1		<u>E X H I B I T S</u>	
		No		entified
General Counsel for the Wisconsin	2	<u>No</u> .	<u>Description</u> <u>Id</u>	entified
General Counsel for the Wisconsin Government Accountability Board,		<u>No</u> . 153	Description Id Wisconsin Legislature Redistricting	entified
General Counsel for the Wisconsin	2		<u>Description</u> <u>Id</u>	entified 90
General Counsel for the Wisconsin Government Accountability Board, Defendants, F. JAMES SENSENBRENNER, JR.,	2 3 4	153	Description Id Wisconsin Legislature Redistricting Staff Working Group Meeting of January 14, 2011	
General Counsel for the Wisconsin Government Accountability Board, Defendants, F. JAMES SENSENBRENNER, JR., THOMAS E. PETRI, PAUL D. RYAN, JR.,	2		Description Id Wisconsin Legislature Redistricting Staff Working Group Meeting of	
General Counsel for the Wisconsin Government Accountability Board, Defendants, F. JAMES SENSENBRENNER, JR.,	2 3 4	153	Description Id Wisconsin Legislature Redistricting Staff Working Group Meeting of January 14, 2011 Defendants' Supplement to the Amended Initial Rule 26(a) Disclosures	9 0
General Counsel for the Wisconsin Government Accountability Board, Defendants, F. JAMES SENSENBRENNER, JR., THOMAS E. PETRI, PAUL D. RYAN, JR.,	2 3 4	153	Description Id Wisconsin Legislature Redistricting Staff Working Group Meeting of January 14, 2011 Defendants' Supplement to the Amended	90
General Counsel for the Wisconsin Government Accountability Board, Defendants, F. JAMES SENSENBRENNER, JR., THOMAS E. PETRI, PAUL D. RYAN, JR., REID J. RIBBLE, and SEAN P. DUFFY,	2 3 4 5 6 7	153	Description Wisconsin Legislature Redistricting Staff Working Group Meeting of January 14, 2011 Defendants' Supplement to the Amended Initial Rule 26(a) Disclosures Letter dated 12/6/11 to Ronald Keith	9 0 9 4
General Counsel for the Wisconsin Government Accountability Board, Defendants, F. JAMES SENSENBRENNER, JR., THOMAS E. PETRI, PAUL D. RYAN, JR., REID J. RIBBLE, and SEAN P. DUFFY,	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	153 154 155	Description Wisconsin Legislature Redistricting Staff Working Group Meeting of January 14, 2011 Defendants' Supplement to the Amended Initial Rule 26(a) Disclosures Letter dated 12/6/11 to Ronald Keith Gaddie from Tony J. Van Der Wielen	9 0 9 4
General Counsel for the Wisconsin Government Accountability Board, Defendants, F. JAMES SENSENBRENNER, JR., THOMAS E. PETRI, PAUL D. RYAN, JR., REID J. RIBBLE, and SEAN P. DUFFY,	2 3 4 5 6 7	153 154 155	Description Wisconsin Legislature Redistricting Staff Working Group Meeting of January 14, 2011 Defendants' Supplement to the Amended Initial Rule 26(a) Disclosures Letter dated 12/6/11 to Ronald Keith Gaddie from Tony J. Van Der Wielen Letter dated 12/6/11 to John Diez	90 94 100
General Counsel for the Wisconsin Government Accountability Board, Defendants, F. JAMES SENSENBRENNER, JR., THOMAS E. PETRI, PAUL D. RYAN, JR., REID J. RIBBLE, and SEAN P. DUFFY, Intervenor-Defendants. VOCES DE LA FRONTERA, INC.,	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	153 154 155	Description Wisconsin Legislature Redistricting Staff Working Group Meeting of January 14, 2011 Defendants' Supplement to the Amended Initial Rule 26(a) Disclosures Letter dated 12/6/11 to Ronald Keith Gaddie from Tony J. Van Der Wielen Letter dated 12/6/11 to John Diez	90 94
General Counsel for the Wisconsin Government Accountability Board, Defendants, F. JAMES SENSENBRENNER, JR., THOMAS E. PETRI, PAUL D. RYAN, JR., REID J. RIBBLE, and SEAN P. DUFFY, Intervenor-Defendants. VOCES DE LA FRONTERA, INC., RAMIRO VARA, OLGA WARA,	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	153 154 155 156	Description Wisconsin Legislature Redistricting Staff Working Group Meeting of January 14, 2011 Defendants' Supplement to the Amended Initial Rule 26(a) Disclosures Letter dated 12/6/11 to Ronald Keith Gaddie from Tony J. Van Der Wielen Letter dated 12/6/11 to John Diez from Tony J. Van Der Wielen	90 94 100
General Counsel for the Wisconsin Government Accountability Board, Defendants, F. JAMES SENSENBRENNER, JR., THOMAS E. PETRI, PAUL D. RYAN, JR., REID J. RIBBLE, and SEAN P. DUFFY, Intervenor-Defendants. VOCES DE LA FRONTERA, INC.,	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	153 154 155 156	Description Wisconsin Legislature Redistricting Staff Working Group Meeting of January 14, 2011 Defendants' Supplement to the Amended Initial Rule 26(a) Disclosures Letter dated 12/6/11 to Ronald Keith Gaddie from Tony J. Van Der Wielen Letter dated 12/6/11 to John Diez	90 94 100 100
General Counsel for the Wisconsin Government Accountability Board, Defendants, F. JAMES SENSENBRENNER, JR., THOMAS E. PETRI, PAUL D. RYAN, JR., REID J. RIBBLE, and SEAN P. DUFFY, Intervenor-Defendants. VOCES DE LA FRONTERA, INC., RAMIRO VARA, OLGA WARA,	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	153 154 155 156	Description Wisconsin Legislature Redistricting Staff Working Group Meeting of January 14, 2011 Defendants' Supplement to the Amended Initial Rule 26(a) Disclosures Letter dated 12/6/11 to Ronald Keith Gaddie from Tony J. Van Der Wielen Letter dated 12/6/11 to John Diez from Tony J. Van Der Wielen original exhibits were attached to the consistency of the state o	90 94 100 100
General Counsel for the Wisconsin Government Accountability Board, Defendants, F. JAMES SENSENBRENNER, JR., THOMAS E. PETRI, PAUL D. RYAN, JR., REID J. RIBBLE, and SEAN P. DUFFY, Intervenor-Defendants. VOCES DE LA FRONTERA, INC., RAMIRO VARA, OLGA WARA, JOSE PEREZ, and ERICA RAMIREZ, Plaintiffs,	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	153 154 155 156	Description Wisconsin Legislature Redistricting Staff Working Group Meeting of January 14, 2011 Defendants' Supplement to the Amended Initial Rule 26(a) Disclosures Letter dated 12/6/11 to Ronald Keith Gaddie from Tony J. Van Der Wielen Letter dated 12/6/11 to John Diez from Tony J. Van Der Wielen original exhibits were attached to the consistency of the state o	90 94 100 100
General Counsel for the Wisconsin Government Accountability Board, Defendants, F. JAMES SENSENBRENNER, JR., THOMAS E. PETRI, PAUL D. RYAN, JR., REID J. RIBBLE, and SEAN P. DUFFY, Intervenor-Defendants. VOCES DE LA FRONTERA, INC., RAMIRO VARA, OLGA WARA, JOSE PEREZ, and ERICA RAMIREZ, Plaintiffs, V. Case No. 11-CV-1011	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	153 154 155 156	Description Wisconsin Legislature Redistricting Staff Working Group Meeting of January 14, 2011 Defendants' Supplement to the Amended Initial Rule 26(a) Disclosures Letter dated 12/6/11 to Ronald Keith Gaddie from Tony J. Van Der Wielen Letter dated 12/6/11 to John Diez from Tony J. Van Der Wielen original exhibits were attached to the consistency of the state o	90 94 100 100
General Counsel for the Wisconsin Government Accountability Board, Defendants, F. JAMES SENSENBRENNER, JR., THOMAS E. PETRI, PAUL D. RYAN, JR., REID J. RIBBLE, and SEAN P. DUFFY, Intervenor-Defendants. VOCES DE LA FRONTERA, INC., RAMIRO VARA, OLGA WARA, JOSE PEREZ, and ERICA RAMIREZ, Plaintiffs, v. Case No. 11-CV-1011 JPS-DPW-RMD	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	153 154 155 156	Description Wisconsin Legislature Redistricting Staff Working Group Meeting of January 14, 2011 Defendants' Supplement to the Amended Initial Rule 26(a) Disclosures Letter dated 12/6/11 to Ronald Keith Gaddie from Tony J. Van Der Wielen Letter dated 12/6/11 to John Diez from Tony J. Van Der Wielen original exhibits were attached to the consistency of the state o	90 94 100 100
General Counsel for the Wisconsin Government Accountability Board, Defendants, F. JAMES SENSENBRENNER, JR., THOMAS E. PETRI, PAUL D. RYAN, JR., REID J. RIBBLE, and SEAN P. DUFFY, Intervenor-Defendants. VOCES DE LA FRONTERA, INC., RAMIRO VARA, OLGA WARA, JOSE PEREZ, and ERICA RAMIREZ, Plaintiffs, v. Case No. 11-CV-1011	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	153 154 155 156	Description Wisconsin Legislature Redistricting Staff Working Group Meeting of January 14, 2011 Defendants' Supplement to the Amended Initial Rule 26(a) Disclosures Letter dated 12/6/11 to Ronald Keith Gaddie from Tony J. Van Der Wielen Letter dated 12/6/11 to John Diez from Tony J. Van Der Wielen original exhibits were attached to the consistency of the state o	90 94 100 100
General Counsel for the Wisconsin Government Accountability Board, Defendants, F. JAMES SENSENBRENNER, JR., THOMAS E. PETRI, PAUL D. RYAN, JR., REID J. RIBBLE, and SEAN P. DUFFY, Intervenor-Defendants. VOCES DE LA FRONTERA, INC., RAMIRO VARA, OLGA WARA, JOSE PEREZ, and ERICA RAMIREZ, Plaintiffs, v. Case No. 11-CV-1011 JPS-DPW-RMD Members of the Wisconsin Government Accountability Board, each only in his official capacity:	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	153 154 155 156	Description Wisconsin Legislature Redistricting Staff Working Group Meeting of January 14, 2011 Defendants' Supplement to the Amended Initial Rule 26(a) Disclosures Letter dated 12/6/11 to Ronald Keith Gaddie from Tony J. Van Der Wielen Letter dated 12/6/11 to John Diez from Tony J. Van Der Wielen original exhibits were attached to the consistency of the state o	90 94 100 100 eriginal
General Counsel for the Wisconsin Government Accountability Board, Defendants, F. JAMES SENSENBRENNER, JR., THOMAS E. PETRI, PAUL D. RYAN, JR., REID J. RIBBLE, and SEAN P. DUFFY, Intervenor-Defendants. VOCES DE LA FRONTERA, INC., RAMIRO VARA, OLGA WARA, JOSE PEREZ, and ERICA RAMIREZ, Plaintiffs, v. Case No. 11-CV-1011 JPS-DPW-RMD Members of the Wisconsin Government Accountability Board, each only in his official capacity: MICHAEL BRENNAN, DAVID DEININGER,	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	153 154 155 156	Description Wisconsin Legislature Redistricting Staff Working Group Meeting of January 14, 2011 Defendants' Supplement to the Amended Initial Rule 26(a) Disclosures Letter dated 12/6/11 to Ronald Keith Gaddie from Tony J. Van Der Wielen Letter dated 12/6/11 to John Diez from Tony J. Van Der Wielen original exhibits were attached to the consistency of the state o	90 94 100 100
General Counsel for the Wisconsin Government Accountability Board, Defendants, F. JAMES SENSENBRENNER, JR., THOMAS E. PETRI, PAUL D. RYAN, JR., REID J. RIBBLE, and SEAN P. DUFFY, Intervenor-Defendants. VOCES DE LA FRONTERA, INC., RAMIRO VARA, OLGA WARA, JOSE PEREZ, and ERICA RAMIREZ, Plaintiffs, v. Case No. 11-CV-1011 JPS-DPW-RMD Members of the Wisconsin Government Accountability Board, each only in his official capacity: MICHAEL BRENNAN, DAVID DEININGER, GERALD NICHOL, THOMAS CANE,	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	153 154 155 156	Description Wisconsin Legislature Redistricting Staff Working Group Meeting of January 14, 2011 Defendants' Supplement to the Amended Initial Rule 26(a) Disclosures Letter dated 12/6/11 to Ronald Keith Gaddie from Tony J. Van Der Wielen Letter dated 12/6/11 to John Diez from Tony J. Van Der Wielen original exhibits were attached to the consistency of the state o	90 94 100 100
General Counsel for the Wisconsin Government Accountability Board, Defendants, F. JAMES SENSENBRENNER, JR., THOMAS E. PETRI, PAUL D. RYAN, JR., REID J. RIBBLE, and SEAN P. DUFFY, Intervenor-Defendants. VOCES DE LA FRONTERA, INC., RAMIRO VARA, OLGA WARA, JOSE PEREZ, and ERICA RAMIREZ, Plaintiffs, v. Case No. 11-CV-1011 JPS-DPW-RMD Members of the Wisconsin Government Accountability Board, each only in his official capacity: MICHAEL BRENNAN, DAVID DEININGER,	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	153 154 155 156	Description Wisconsin Legislature Redistricting Staff Working Group Meeting of January 14, 2011 Defendants' Supplement to the Amended Initial Rule 26(a) Disclosures Letter dated 12/6/11 to Ronald Keith Gaddie from Tony J. Van Der Wielen Letter dated 12/6/11 to John Diez from Tony J. Van Der Wielen original exhibits were attached to the consistency of the state o	90 94 100 100
General Counsel for the Wisconsin Government Accountability Board, Defendants, F. JAMES SENSENBRENNER, JR., THOMAS E. PETRI, PAUL D. RYAN, JR., REID J. RIBBLE, and SEAN P. DUFFY, Intervenor-Defendants. VOCES DE LA FRONTERA, INC., RAMIRO VARA, OLGA WARA, JOSE PEREZ, and ERICA RAMIREZ, Plaintiffs, v. Case No. 11-CV-1011 JPS-DPW-RMD Members of the Wisconsin Government Accountability Board, each only in his official capacity: MICHAEL BRENNAN, DAVID DEININGER, GERALD NICHOL, THOMAS CANE, THOMAS BARLAND, and TIMOTHY VOCKE, and KEVIN KENNEDY, Director and General Counsel for the Wisconsin	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	153 154 155 156	Description Wisconsin Legislature Redistricting Staff Working Group Meeting of January 14, 2011 Defendants' Supplement to the Amended Initial Rule 26(a) Disclosures Letter dated 12/6/11 to Ronald Keith Gaddie from Tony J. Van Der Wielen Letter dated 12/6/11 to John Diez from Tony J. Van Der Wielen original exhibits were attached to the consistency of the state o	90 94 100 100 eriginal
General Counsel for the Wisconsin Government Accountability Board, Defendants, F. JAMES SENSENBRENNER, JR., THOMAS E. PETRI, PAUL D. RYAN, JR., REID J. RIBBLE, and SEAN P. DUFFY, Intervenor-Defendants. VOCES DE LA FRONTERA, INC., RAMIRO VARA, OLGA WARA, JOSE PEREZ, and ERICA RAMIREZ, Plaintiffs, v. Case No. 11-CV-1011 JPS-DPW-RMD Members of the Wisconsin Government Accountability Board, each only in his official capacity: MICHAEL BRENNAN, DAVID DEININGER, GERALD NICHOL, THOMAS CANE, THOMAS BARLAND, and TIMOTHY VOCKE, and KEVIN KENNEDY, Director and	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	153 154 155 156	Description Wisconsin Legislature Redistricting Staff Working Group Meeting of January 14, 2011 Defendants' Supplement to the Amended Initial Rule 26(a) Disclosures Letter dated 12/6/11 to Ronald Keith Gaddie from Tony J. Van Der Wielen Letter dated 12/6/11 to John Diez from Tony J. Van Der Wielen original exhibits were attached to the consistency of the state o	90 94 100 100 eriginal
General Counsel for the Wisconsin Government Accountability Board, Defendants, F. JAMES SENSENBRENNER, JR., THOMAS E. PETRI, PAUL D. RYAN, JR., REID J. RIBBLE, and SEAN P. DUFFY, Intervenor-Defendants. VOCES DE LA FRONTERA, INC., RAMIRO VARA, OLGA WARA, JOSE PEREZ, and ERICA RAMIREZ, Plaintiffs, v. Case No. 11-CV-1011 JPS-DPW-RMD Members of the Wisconsin Government Accountability Board, each only in his official capacity: MICHAEL BRENNAN, DAVID DEININGER, GERALD NICHOL, THOMAS CANE, THOMAS BARLAND, and TIMOTHY VOCKE, and KEVIN KENNEDY, Director and General Counsel for the Wisconsin Government Accountability Board,	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	153 154 155 156	Description Wisconsin Legislature Redistricting Staff Working Group Meeting of January 14, 2011 Defendants' Supplement to the Amended Initial Rule 26(a) Disclosures Letter dated 12/6/11 to Ronald Keith Gaddie from Tony J. Van Der Wielen Letter dated 12/6/11 to John Diez from Tony J. Van Der Wielen original exhibits were attached to the consistency of the state o	90 94 100 100
General Counsel for the Wisconsin Government Accountability Board, Defendants, F. JAMES SENSENBRENNER, JR., THOMAS E. PETRI, PAUL D. RYAN, JR., REID J. RIBBLE, and SEAN P. DUFFY, Intervenor-Defendants. VOCES DE LA FRONTERA, INC., RAMIRO VARA, OLGA WARA, JOSE PEREZ, and ERICA RAMIREZ, Plaintiffs, v. Case No. 11-CV-1011 JPS-DPW-RMD Members of the Wisconsin Government Accountability Board, each only in his official capacity: MICHAEL BRENNAN, DAVID DEININGER, GERALD NICHOL, THOMAS CANE, THOMAS BARLAND, and TIMOTHY VOCKE, and KEVIN KENNEDY, Director and General Counsel for the Wisconsin	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	153 154 155 156	Description Wisconsin Legislature Redistricting Staff Working Group Meeting of January 14, 2011 Defendants' Supplement to the Amended Initial Rule 26(a) Disclosures Letter dated 12/6/11 to Ronald Keith Gaddie from Tony J. Van Der Wielen Letter dated 12/6/11 to John Diez from Tony J. Van Der Wielen original exhibits were attached to the consistency of the state o	90 94 100 100
General Counsel for the Wisconsin Government Accountability Board, Defendants, F. JAMES SENSENBRENNER, JR., THOMAS E. PETRI, PAUL D. RYAN, JR., REID J. RIBBLE, and SEAN P. DUFFY, Intervenor-Defendants. VOCES DE LA FRONTERA, INC., RAMIRO VARA, OLGA WARA, JOSE PEREZ, and ERICA RAMIREZ, Plaintiffs, v. Case No. 11-CV-1011 JPS-DPW-RMD Members of the Wisconsin Government Accountability Board, each only in his official capacity: MICHAEL BRENNAN, DAVID DEININGER, GERALD NICHOL, THOMAS CANE, THOMAS BARLAND, and TIMOTHY VOCKE, and KEVIN KENNEDY, Director and General Counsel for the Wisconsin Government Accountability Board,	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	153 154 155 156	Description Wisconsin Legislature Redistricting Staff Working Group Meeting of January 14, 2011 Defendants' Supplement to the Amended Initial Rule 26(a) Disclosures Letter dated 12/6/11 to Ronald Keith Gaddie from Tony J. Van Der Wielen Letter dated 12/6/11 to John Diez from Tony J. Van Der Wielen original exhibits were attached to the consistency of the state o	90 94 100 100
General Counsel for the Wisconsin Government Accountability Board, Defendants, F. JAMES SENSENBRENNER, JR., THOMAS E. PETRI, PAUL D. RYAN, JR., REID J. RIBBLE, and SEAN P. DUFFY, Intervenor-Defendants. VOCES DE LA FRONTERA, INC., RAMIRO VARA, OLGA WARA, JOSE PEREZ, and ERICA RAMIREZ, Plaintiffs, v. Case No. 11-CV-1011 JPS-DPW-RMD Members of the Wisconsin Government Accountability Board, each only in his official capacity: MICHAEL BRENNAN, DAVID DEININGER, GERALD NICHOL, THOMAS CANE, THOMAS BARLAND, and TIMOTHY VOCKE, and KEVIN KENNEDY, Director and General Counsel for the Wisconsin Government Accountability Board,	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	153 154 155 156	Description Wisconsin Legislature Redistricting Staff Working Group Meeting of January 14, 2011 Defendants' Supplement to the Amended Initial Rule 26(a) Disclosures Letter dated 12/6/11 to Ronald Keith Gaddie from Tony J. Van Der Wielen Letter dated 12/6/11 to John Diez from Tony J. Van Der Wielen original exhibits were attached to the consistency of the state o	90 94 100 100
General Counsel for the Wisconsin Government Accountability Board, Defendants, F. JAMES SENSENBRENNER, JR., THOMAS E. PETRI, PAUL D. RYAN, JR., REID J. RIBBLE, and SEAN P. DUFFY, Intervenor-Defendants. VOCES DE LA FRONTERA, INC., RAMIRO VARA, OLGA WARA, JOSE PEREZ, and ERICA RAMIREZ, Plaintiffs, v. Case No. 11-CV-1011 JPS-DPW-RMD Members of the Wisconsin Government Accountability Board, each only in his official capacity: MICHAEL BRENNAN, DAVID DEININGER, GERALD NICHOL, THOMAS CANE, THOMAS BARLAND, and TIMOTHY VOCKE, and KEVIN KENNEDY, Director and General Counsel for the Wisconsin Government Accountability Board,	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	153 154 155 156	Description Wisconsin Legislature Redistricting Staff Working Group Meeting of January 14, 2011 Defendants' Supplement to the Amended Initial Rule 26(a) Disclosures Letter dated 12/6/11 to Ronald Keith Gaddie from Tony J. Van Der Wielen Letter dated 12/6/11 to John Diez from Tony J. Van Der Wielen original exhibits were attached to the consistency of the state o	90 94 100 100
General Counsel for the Wisconsin Government Accountability Board, Defendants, F. JAMES SENSENBRENNER, JR., THOMAS E. PETRI, PAUL D. RYAN, JR., REID J. RIBBLE, and SEAN P. DUFFY, Intervenor-Defendants. VOCES DE LA FRONTERA, INC., RAMIRO VARA, OLGA WARA, JOSE PEREZ, and ERICA RAMIREZ, Plaintiffs, v. Case No. 11-CV-1011 JPS-DPW-RMD Members of the Wisconsin Government Accountability Board, each only in his official capacity: MICHAEL BRENNAN, DAVID DEININGER, GERALD NICHOL, THOMAS CANE, THOMAS BARLAND, and TIMOTHY VOCKE, and KEVIN KENNEDY, Director and General Counsel for the Wisconsin Government Accountability Board,	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	153 154 155 156 (The tr	Description Wisconsin Legislature Redistricting Staff Working Group Meeting of January 14, 2011 Defendants' Supplement to the Amended Initial Rule 26(a) Disclosures Letter dated 12/6/11 to Ronald Keith Gaddie from Tony J. Van Der Wielen Letter dated 12/6/11 to John Diez from Tony J. Van Der Wielen original exhibits were attached to the canscript and copies were provided to cou	90 94 100 100 original
General Counsel for the Wisconsin Government Accountability Board, Defendants, F. JAMES SENSENBRENNER, JR., THOMAS E. PETRI, PAUL D. RYAN, JR., REID J. RIBBLE, and SEAN P. DUFFY, Intervenor-Defendants. VOCES DE LA FRONTERA, INC., RAMIRO VARA, OLGA WARA, JOSE PEREZ, and ERICA RAMIREZ, Plaintiffs, v. Case No. 11-CV-1011 JPS-DPW-RMD Members of the Wisconsin Government Accountability Board, each only in his official capacity: MICHAEL BRENNAN, DAVID DEININGER, GERALD NICHOL, THOMAS CANE, THOMAS BARLAND, and TIMOTHY VOCKE, and KEVIN KENNEDY, Director and General Counsel for the Wisconsin Government Accountability Board,	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	153 154 155 156 (The tr	Description Wisconsin Legislature Redistricting Staff Working Group Meeting of January 14, 2011 Defendants' Supplement to the Amended Initial Rule 26(a) Disclosures Letter dated 12/6/11 to Ronald Keith Gaddie from Tony J. Van Der Wielen Letter dated 12/6/11 to John Diez from Tony J. Van Der Wielen original exhibits were attached to the canscript and copies were provided to cou	90 94 100 100 original
General Counsel for the Wisconsin Government Accountability Board, Defendants, F. JAMES SENSENBRENNER, JR., THOMAS E. PETRI, PAUL D. RYAN, JR., REID J. RIBBLE, and SEAN P. DUFFY, Intervenor-Defendants. VOCES DE LA FRONTERA, INC., RAMIRO VARA, OLGA WARA, JOSE PEREZ, and ERICA RAMIREZ, Plaintiffs, v. Case No. 11-CV-1011 JPS-DPW-RMD Members of the Wisconsin Government Accountability Board, each only in his official capacity: MICHAEL BRENNAN, DAVID DEININGER, GERALD NICHOL, THOMAS CANE, THOMAS BARLAND, and TIMOTHY VOCKE, and KEVIN KENNEDY, Director and General Counsel for the Wisconsin Government Accountability Board,	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	153 154 155 156 (The tr	Description Wisconsin Legislature Redistricting Staff Working Group Meeting of January 14, 2011 Defendants' Supplement to the Amended Initial Rule 26(a) Disclosures Letter dated 12/6/11 to Ronald Keith Gaddie from Tony J. Van Der Wielen Letter dated 12/6/11 to John Diez from Tony J. Van Der Wielen original exhibits were attached to the canscript and copies were provided to cou	90 94 100 100 original

```
VIDEOTAPE DEPOSITION of TONY J. VAN DER WIELEN,
                                                                                 TONY J. VAN DER WIELEN,
 2
    a witness of lawful age, taken on behalf of the
                                                                2
                                                                          called as a witness, being first duly sworn,
 3
    Plaintiffs, wherein Alvin Baldus, et al., are
 4
    Plaintiffs, and Members of the Wisconsin Government
                                                                3
                                                                          testified on oath as follows:
   Accountability Board, et al., are Defendants, pending
                                                                4
 6
    in the United States District Court for the
                                                                5
   Eastern District of Wisconsin, pursuant to subpoena,
                                                                                      EXAMINATION
 oldsymbol{8} before Sarah Finley Pelletter, a Registered
                                                                6 By Mr. Poland:
 9
   Professional Reporter and Notary Public in and for
                                                               7 Q Good morning, Mr. Van Der Wielen.
10
    the State of Wisconsin, at the offices of
11
    Godfrey & Kahn, S.C., Attorneys at Law, One East Main
                                                                   A Good morning.
12
    Street, in the City of Madison, County of Dane, and
                                                                   Q Have you been deposed before?
13
    State of Wisconsin, on the 7th day of February 2012,
    commencing at 9:16 in the forenoon.
                                                               10 A No.
15
                                                               11
                                                                   Q You've never had your deposition taken before?
16
                                                               12 A No.
                                                               13
                                                                  Q Let me give you a couple of what we'll just sort
17
                   APPEARANCES
                                                               14
                                                                      of call ground rules. I'm Doug Poland. I
18
                                                               15
                                                                      represent one of the groups of the plaintiffs in
                                                               16
                                                                      this particular lawsuit. And we've asked you --
19
    DOUGLAS M. POLAND, Attorney,
    for GODFREY & KAHN, S.C., Attorneys at Law,
                                                               17
                                                                      well, we've sent you a subpoena. I understand
20
           One East Main Street, Suite 500, Madison,
                                                               18
                                                                      you're here today pursuant to subpoena testifying.
           Wisconsin 53703, appearing on behalf of
                                                               19
                                                                      The procedure of the deposition is that I will ask
21
           Plaintiffs Alvin Baldus, et al.
                                                               20
                                                                      you questions, and the court reporter, who is
22
                                                               21
                                                                      sitting here to your left, will be taking down the
    JACQUELINE BOYNTON, Attorney at Law,
23
           2266 North Prospect Avenue, Suite 505,
                                                               22
                                                                      answers to the questions as well as my questions.
           Milwaukee, Wisconsin 53202, appearing by
                                                               23
                                                                      In addition, there is a videographer who is
24
           telephone on behalf of Plaintiffs
           Voces De La Frontera, Inc., et al.
                                                               24
                                                                      videotaping the deposition.
25
                                                               25
                                                                           The deposition could be used for a number of
                      APPEARANCES
                                                                1
                                                                      different purposes, at trial, could be used at
 2
                                                                2
                                                                      trial, maybe not, we don't know at this point, but
                                                                3
                                                                       I wanted to make sure that you understood that the
 3
    MARIA S. LAZAR, Assistant Attorney General,
    for STATE OF WISCONSIN DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE,
                                                                      deposition is being transcribed. There also are
           17 West Main Street, Madison, Wisconsin 53703,
           appearing on behalf of the Defendants.
                                                                      counsel, other lawyers for other parties who are
 5
                                                                6
                                                                      here today. They may have some objections to
 6
    DANIEL KELLY, Attorney,
                                                                7
                                                                      questions that I ask. They're allowed to make
    for REINHART BOERNER VAN DEUREN S.C.,
 7
           Attorneys at Law, 1000 North Water Street,
                                                                      those objections, and then unless you're
           Suite 2100, Milwaukee, Wisconsin 53202,
                                                                9
 8
                                                                      instructed by an attorney not to answer a
           appearing on behalf of the Defendants.
                                                               10
                                                                      question, you will need to answer the questions.
 9
    ERIC M. MCLEOD, Attorney,
                                                               11
                                                                      Do you understand that?
10
    for MICHAEL BEST & FRIEDRICH LLP, Attorneys at Law,
                                                                  A Yep.
                                                               12
           One South Pinckney Street, Suite 700, Madison,
11
           Wisconsin 53703, appearing on behalf of the
                                                               13
                                                                   Q If I ask a question that you don't understand for
           Wisconsin State Senate by its Majority Leader
12
           Scott Fitzgerald, the Wisconsin Assembly by its
                                                               14
                                                                      any reason at all, please feel free, I would
           Speaker Jeff Fitzgerald, and Tony J. Van Der
                                                               15
                                                                      appreciate it if you would tell me that you don't
13
           Wielen.
                                                               16
                                                                      understand it, I can restate the question,
14
                                                               17
                                                                      rephrase the question, so that we can get an
    Also present: James Porter, CDVS
15
                                                               18
                                                                      understanding about questions that I'm asking
                    Campbell Legal Video Company
16
                    417 Heather Lane, Suite B
                                                               19
                                                                      before you give answers.
                    Fredonia, WI 53021
17
                                                               20
                                                                  A Okav.
                    (262) 447-2199
                                                               21
                                                                   Q Are you represented by counsel here today?
18
                                                               22 A I believe so.
20
21
22
23
                                                               23
                                                                                    THE WITNESS: Am I?
                                                               24
                                                                  A Yes.
24
                                                               25 Q Is Mr. McLeod acting as your counsel here today?
25
```

```
A Yep.
 2
    {f Q} Did Mr. McLeod give you a copy of a subpoena that
                                                             2
                                                                Q Then it goes down, and it appears that you have
 3
       was sent for your deposition?
                                                             3
                                                                    set out numbers, paragraphs numbers 1 through 12
 4
    A Yes.
                                                                    that are in response to each of the paragraphs in
 5
                    MR. POLAND: Let's mark this as
                                                                    Exhibit A to the subpoena; is that correct?
 6
                                                             6
                                                                A Yep.
           Exhibit No. 145.
 7
                                                             7
                (Exhibit No. 145 marked for
                                                                Q Let's go ahead and run through those in just a
 8
                    identification)
                                                                    minute, but before I do, I want to make sure that
 9
    Q Before we get into the document, I should also
                                                                    I understand your position and the agency or part
10
                                                            10
       mention that if you need to take a break at any
                                                                    of the state government that you work for. Okay?
11
                                                            11
       time today, let me know. We can't take a break
                                                                A Sure.
12
                                                            12
       while a question is pending, but at any other
                                                                 Q What is your -- you work for the LT -- Legislative
                                                            13
13
       time, if you need a break, just let me know.
                                                                    Technology Services Bureau, correct?
                                                            14
14
                                                                A Yes.
    A Okay. Thank you.
15
                                                            15 Q LTSB?
    Q Mr. Van Der Wielen, I'm handing you a copy of a
16
                                                            16
       document that's been marked as Exhibit No. 145.
17
                                                            17
       Would you please identify that document for the
                                                                 Q So if I use the term LTSB, we'll know that we're
18
                                                            18
       record?
                                                                   referring to that particular bureau?
                                                            19
19
    A Subpoena given to me.
20
    Q That's for your deposition here today, correct?
                                                            20
                                                                 Q What does the LTSB do?
21
                                                            21
    A Yep.
                                                                 A We're the non-partisan technical service agency
22
    Q I'd like you to turn to the, it's the third to the
                                                            22
                                                                    for the Wisconsin legislature.
23
       last page of Exhibit 145, and that is an
                                                            23
                                                                Q What kinds of things does the LTSB do for the
24
                                                            24
       Exhibit A. Do you see that?
                                                                    legislature; what's its role?
25
                                                            25
   A Yes.
                                                                A We have several teams at LTSB. We have an
                           9
                                                                                       11
1
    Q That identifies a number of categories of
                                                             1
                                                                    enterprise team, which takes care of all the
 2
       documents that we have asked for you -- asked you
                                                             2
                                                                    servers and networking for the Wisconsin
 3
                                                             3
       to look for, correct?
                                                                    legislature. We have a technical support unit
   A Yep.
                                                                    that fields calls on computer-related issues. We
    Q Have you done that; have you looked for the
                                                                    have an administration team that's internal for.
                                                             6
       documents identified in Exhibit A?
                                                                    just internal administrative things for the
 7
   A Yes.
                                                                    bureau. We have a Geographic Information System
    Q You've brought some documents with you today; am I
                                                                    team. That's a team I am the team manager of. We
 q
                                                             q
       correct?
                                                                    provide demographic and geographic analysis for
10
                                                            10
    A Yep.
                                                                    the legislature, revise standard maps for
11
                    MR. POLAND: Let's go ahead and
                                                            11
                                                                    legislators and legislative staff and also the
12
                                                            12
           mark this as Exhibit 146.
                                                                    general public, and we also are heavily involved
13
                                                            13
                (Exhibit No. 146 marked for
                                                                    in redistricting. We are the liaison to the
14
                                                            14
                identification)
                                                                    U.S. Census Bureau for the redistricting data
15
    Q Mr. Van Der Wielen, the court reporter has handed
                                                            15
16
       you a document that we've marked as Exhibit
                                                            16
                                                                 Q Would you describe what your title and your role
17
                                                            17
       No. 146. Do you have that in front of you?
                                                                    are with the LTSB?
18
                                                            18
    A Yes.
                                                                 A I'm the GIS manager.
19
    Q Would you identify that document please?
                                                            19
                                                                 Q What do you do as the GIS manager?
                                                            20
20
    A It's a document I produced in response to the
                                                                A I manage, currently, three geographers on the
21
                                                            21
       subpoena.
                                                                    team. And I also provide technical support,
22
                                                            22
    Q So the document -- Exhibit 146 at the top states,
                                                                    again, geographic, demographic analysis for the
23
                                                            23
                                                                    legislative agencies and their staff, also the
       "Documents Produced in Response to Subpoena Issued
24
       by Plaintiffs to Tony J. Van Der Wielen Dated
                                                                    general public.
25
                                                            25
       February 3rd, 2012." Do you see that?
                                                                Q What kind of support do you provide for the
```

general public? A Yes. 2 A We do standard map requests for them, so if 2 Q Terrific. All right. Why don't you tell me then 3 someone who would want a map of a legislative 3 what, as we run through these, this request here 4 district, we would be able to handle that request and responses you've put down, what's on that 5 on a cost-recovery basis, we do that. Answer thumb drive. 6 A Okay. So for the first request, under data, there general questions. 7 7 Q And you testified that you are involved, you are Statewide 10 folders, and the Statewide 10 8 personally and your GIS team are involved in the 8 folders contain the redistricting data. It's 9 redistricting effort, correct? Public Law 94-171 redistricting data, the 10 10 A Yes. redistricting population totals. It also includes 11 11 Q That's what we're going to be focusing on here TIGER 2010 geography. Those are merged together. 12 12 today, is the redistricting, that's the subject of And then also the election data disaggregated to 13 13 the lawsuit, and so that's what I really want to the 2010 census collection blocks. 14 14 Q So all of these files that are identified in focus on. 15 15 A Okay. Deposition Exhibit 146, in paragraph 1(a), those 16 16 are on a -- those are in a single folder that's Q Do you understand that? 17 17 A Yep. contained on the thumb drive? 18 Q All right. Let's go back to Exhibit Nos. 145 and 18 A Yes. Keep going? 19 146 then, so I can understand what you've brought 19 Q Yes, please do. 20 with you today. 20 A Okay. Good. So under reports, I included all the 21 21 A Sure. base reports that were included in the AutoBound 22 Q So paragraph 1 of Exhibit A, and I won't read it 22 software. That was the software that was selected 23 out in full, it's set forth in Deposition 23 for legislative redistricting. 24 24 Exhibit 145, but it makes a request for some Q When you say base reports, what are the base 25 25 materials. And then you have provided us with an reports? 13 15 1 answer in Exhibit 146, and you state in that 1 A Base reports are just something that was included 2 answer, "I have placed the base redistricting data 2 with the software when it was purchased. But it 3 and reports given to all leadership offices in 3 also, there are some custom reports, and I've 4 4 this folder." Now, what folder are you referring listed those here that we've created. to there? Q So the base reports were included in the AutoBound 6 6 A On each one of the thumb drives, there's a folder software by the designer or the manufacturer of 7 structure that has 1 through 12 that correspond to 7 that software? the -- each request that's in the subpoena. A Right. Yes. 9 Q Let's go ahead, why don't you hand me a copy, or 9 Q Very well. 10 10 one of those thumb drives. Let's have this marked A These custom reports were created specifically for 11 as an exhibit. 11 bill drafting. The assembly senate report just 12 12 (Exhibit No. 147 marked for lists the assembly and senate district with the 13 13 identification) population totals. The assembly minimum and 14 14 Q Mr. Van Der Wielen, I'm handing you the thumb maximum, those are the maximum -- the 15 15 drive, which we've marked as Exhibit No. 147. population -- the district with the maximum 16 That's a thumb drive that you've brought with you 16 population and the minimum population. Same thing 17 17 today, correct? for the senate. 18 18 A Yep. Final table has some deviation numbers in it 19 Q And you've brought four copies of the same thumb 19 that were used for the bill draft. The multilevel 20 20 drive; is that correct? is a listing of geography that is included with 21 A Yep. 21 each of the districts if districts are created in 22 22 Q So that Exhibit -- what we've marked as the software. Congressional report is the same as 23 23 Exhibit 147, the other three thumb drives that are the assembly senate report except it's for 24 there in front of you are identical to 24 congressional districts. Minimum/maximum for 25 25 Exhibit 147? congressional districts, final table for congress,

again, all these are for bill drafting purposes. 2 ${f Q}$ Who requested the custom template reports be built 2 3 by LTSB? 4 A It's not that they were requested, but it would 4 5 5 have been impossible to do a bill draft without 6 6 having those reports created. So we worked with 7 7 the Legislative Reference Bureau to get those 8 reports created and put in the system. 8 Q Are these the types of reports that typically are 10 created as part of the redistricting process? 10 11 11 A Pretty standard stuff. 12 12 Q You said it would have been impossible to draft 13 13 the redistricting bills without these particular 14 14 reports? 15 15 A Right. The reports are the interface to the bill 16 16 draft system. 17 17 Q Let me circle back to one item that I neglected to 18 ask you at the outset here. Under number 1, 18 19 19 paragraph 1 on Exhibit 146, you say the reports 20 given to all leadership offices? 20 21 21 A Yep. 22 22 Q When you say all leadership offices, who is 23 23 included there? 24 24 A Senator Miller, Representative Barca, 25 25 Senator Fitzgerald, Representative Fitzgerald. 17 1 Q So everything within category number 1 here on 1 2 Exhibit 146 was given to the four individuals that 3 3 you just mentioned? A Yep. Q Very well. All right. Can we jump back down then 6 6 to --7 A Sure. 7 Q -- paragraph B, and I think we're on little Roman q number 3? q 10 10 A Custom templates. Those template reports, we did 11 create a disenfranchisement report, and that 11 12 12 would -- we created a disenfranchisement report 13 13 that's included there. 14 14 Q What did the disenfranchisement report, what was 15 the purpose of that? 15 16 A Just to see if people had moved from, I believe it 16 17 17 was an odd number to an even number senate 18 18 district, to see if they would be missing an 19 election with any district that was created. 19 20 20 Q When you use the term moved, you don't mean 21 21 literally physically moved, correct? 22 22 A No. 23 23 Q You mean they would have been -- their new district assignment would be different than their 24 Q So there are a few other categories we'll see as

old district assignment; is that fair?

25

A Correct. Yep. Q All right. And then little Roman numeral 4? A These are documents that are pretty dry to read, but they are the data calculations for the PL 94-171 data. The Census Bureau data comes with 256 fields times two, so 512 fields of data. Department of Justice, federal Department of Justice gave us guidance on how to cram those all into 18 categories. So these are the categories. This document explains those categories and how they were kind of collected. The second one, DOJ guidance, that is the actual guidance from the Department of Justice. The PL 94-171 Tech Doc is 200 pages of census jargon. TIGER shapefile Tech Doc too, it just explains everything about TIGER. And then the election data disaggregation document that is there explains the process for disaggregating election data with all the current datasets that we have. Q When did you provide all leadership offices with all of these files that are identified in paragraph number 1? A Oh, that would have been sometime in March. It would have been March, the third week in March 19 probably, somewhere around that date. 2 Q March 2011, correct? A Yes. Yep. Q All right. So all of those electronic files are on folders contained on the thumb drive that we've marked as Exhibit 147, correct? A Yep. Q Is there anything else on the thumb drive or -that's not identified here on paragraph 1? A I don't believe so. Q So let's look at number 2. Again, I'm not going to read these all into the record; they're in Exhibit A. You've identified no documents responsive to paragraph 2; is that correct? A Right. Q Number 3, your response that, you state you've placed the Redistricting Staff Working Group member list and meeting notes for the January 11, 2011 meeting in the RSWG folder? Q so is that a -- that's another folder then that's on the flash drive?

we go through here that are actually on the flash

25

Q What is that analysis? 2 A Well, it's, so in folder number 2 -- or folder A so we were asked to perform an analysis on the 3 number 3, you'll see an RSWG folder. 3 differing datasets. We collect WISE-LR data or Q All right. census-related data from local officials. We 5 5 A When you plug in the flash drive, you'll see one tried to help them with the local redistricting 6 folder called deposition. When you open that up, process as much as we could to get the ward 7 7 there will be 12 folders. When you go to number information back. The Government Accountability 8 3 --8 Board had been collecting data from local Q Got it. officials that was different. So during a meeting 10 A -- you'll see that there's two folders in there; 10 they asked us if we could perform an analysis on 11 11 one is RSWG, and the other one is training. the data to see if there was -- to note the 12 12 Q Got it. All right. So there is a specific folder differences in the datasets. 13 13 in response to each numbered paragraph? Q There are some documents --14 14 A Yep. A That's what we did. 15 Q Perfect. Very organized. Thank you. Number 4, 15 Q There were some documents that were produced to us 16 16 you have nothing in response to that request, last week by the defendants in this case. The 17 17 correct? defendants is actually the individual members of A Yeah, nothing. 18 18 the Government Accountability Board, in their 19 19 Q Number 5, it would be coextensive with the first official capacities. There were a few documents 20 request? 20 that were within that production. I'm going to 21 A I believe so. I mean, it's. 21 show you this document, ask you if you can 22 Q All right. Number 6 -- and all we can do is ask 22 identify it. If you can, then we'll mark it as an 23 23 exhibit and I'll ask you about it, but let me for documents that are within your possession, 24 24 custody or control. first, just let the record reflect that I'm 25 A Okay. 25 handing the witness a copy of a document that has 21 23 1 Q So if there's something that exists outside of 1 a GAB Bates number on it I think begins document 2 2 your possession, custody and control that you number 13, page 13. No, make that page 15. Is 3 3 that the WISE-LR document you were talking about, don't know about, I'm not asking you to speculate what else might be out there, you're not the analysis document? responsible for that, it's just what's within your A Yes and no. 6 Q Okay. 6 own possession, custody and control, okay? A so. 7 A Okay. 7 8 Q Number 6, you say you've placed a document with Q Let's go ahead and mark it then. I do have q questions for the GAB, map generated by q copies. I've got a clean copy that we'll mark as 10 10 Rock County and any related e-mail into that an exhibit. The number on the bottom is? 11 folder? 11 A 15. 12 12 A Yes. Q Mr. Van Der Wielen, just so that you know what I'm 13 13 Q Number 7, you state you've placed analysis of talking about, we have numbers that -- lawyers 14 14 WISE-LR and adjusted GAB datasets (with maps), a have numbers that we put on the bottom of 15 15 draft document (GAB leadership) that explains documents when we produce them to each other and 16 datasets and the results of their analysis and any 16 give them to each other. It's just called a Bates 17 17 related e-mails? number, for reasons I won't get into. 18 A Yes. 18 (Exhibit No. 148 marked for 19 19 Q That's all on the flash drive? identification) 20 20 Q And so that's what I'm referring to when I refer 21 21 Q I'm going to try to do this, just asking you for to Bates numbers. 22 A Okay. 22 the description, you say you've placed the 23 analysis of WISE-LR. Is that a separate 23 Q So I'm handing you a copy of that exhibit. I'll standalone document, analysis of WISE-LR? 24 take my marked copy back, and I'll get counsel 25 A Yes. 25 their copies as well.

Mr. Van Der Wielen, we've handed you a copy each county had a login and a password. When you 2 2 of a document that has been marked as Exhibit logged into the application, you were able to draw 3 No. 148. Do you have that in front of you? 3 a supervisory district off of U.S. census blocks, an alderman district, and also municipal wards. Q Have you seen Exhibit 148 before? Q When was WISE-LR created? 6 A WISE-LR was, it was a project that started about A I've seen the first two pages, and I've seen the 7 7 last several pages here, but we did not create the two years ago. So we had a pilot program for our 8 last -- pages 3 through 9. 8 local officials to use, and then the official Q All right. Did you create pages, and by we, or 9 release was sometime the third week of March. It 10 10 you, I'm asking about LTSB, did you create the took about a year to create after the pilot took 11 11 first two pages of Exhibit 148? place. 12 A Yes. 12 Q That was for the purpose of creating wards; is 13 13 Q Is this the analysis of WISE-LR and adjusted GAB that correct? 14 14 A Yep. It was for the purpose of helping local datasets to which you were referring in your 15 15 response paragraph number 7 -officials meet their statutory requirements to 16 A Yes. 16 perform local redistricting and all facets of it, 17 Q -- to the subpoena? 17 including municipal wards. 18 A Yep. 18 **Q** Wards are the starting point because they're the 19 19 Q Would you identify for me then, or if you can, building blocks for the other districts in 20 summarize the first two pages of Exhibit 148? 20 Wisconsin; is that correct? 21 21 A Sure. So again, we were asked to do an analysis A During the beginning of the project, the statutes 22 22 of the WISE-LR dataset or the census-based dataset basically said that we need to collect wards to 23 that local officials had created. They had used 23 build legislative districts. I'm not sure, I may 24 WISE-LR to create their municipal ward data. The 24 have misstated that or not, I'm not -- the LRB 25 25 Government Accountability had also been collecting would actually be able to clarify that probably a 27 1 some other datasets from local officials, and 1 little bit more. But yes, to perform local 2 2 again, they asked us to look at the two datasets redistricting, to get the ward information, and 3 3 and determine if there was any difference between the ward information typically would have been the two. So as part of the analysis, we took the used to create legislative districts. WISE-LR dataset and the files that the Government Q So there is a WISE-LR database then that's created 6 6 Accountability Board gave us, and the goal was to by this process of the municipalities going 7 find the difference or the areas where the data 7 through? would intersect. 8 A It is the exact same dataset that is located in 9 Q If I could stop you there. q the Statewide 10 folder. So it's all the same 10 10 A Sure. data. 11 Q I want to back up one second here to make sure 11 Q Statewide 10 folder? 12 that I understand everything. You mentioned the 12 A Yep. 13 13 WISE-LR dataset, correct? Q All right. Got it. So then, I believe your 14 A Yes. 14 testimony was that you were asked to analyze the 15 15 Q What is the WISE-LR dataset? WISE-LR dataset and then compare that to another 16 A So WISE-LR -- to back up a little bit. LTSB, with 16 dataset that you received from, did you say from 17 17 the University of Wisconsin and the LRB, created GAB? 18 18 something called WISE-LR. It was an application, A Yep. So all 72 counties use the application, the 19 an online application that took all the census 19 WISE-LR application to build municipal wards. So 20 20 we had a statewide dataset of municipal wards. geography, census blocks, along with the Public 21 21 Law 94-171 data, and merged it into an online GAB had collected I believe it was an additional 22 22 application. So then we contacted all the 72 19 counties of data that was different than the 23 23 municipal clerks of the state and had them specify data submitted to the legislature, so they wanted GIS contact within each county, and we issued 24 us to take a look at the two datasets and see what 25 25

the difference between the two was.

logins to each one of them. So for each county,

- VIDEOTAPE DEPOSITION OF TONY J. VAN DER WIELEN 2/7/2012 Q Now, when was the WISE-LR dataset complete with a local municipality had grouped both of these 2 2 the information provided by the 72 counties? blocks into one ward, they would have to split 3 A It's a moving target. So the -- we've had several 3 that block, or split the ward based on the two 4 snapshots of data. All data was supposed to be blocks. So one block would be on this side, one 5 5 given to the legislature by September 19th, but block would be on that side. 6 ${f Q}$ I see. So -- and this was my misunderstanding. due to Act 39 and just changes to municipal lines, 7 7 we've been updating the data as things flow in to So what you're saying is that the wards can 8 8 consist of multiple census blocks? 9 Q Why was the timing or the finality of WISE-LR 9 A They do. 10 10 affected by Act 39? Q They consist -- in all situations, all 11 11 A It wasn't per se. I mean, local -- as far as I circumstances they consist of multiple? 12 12 know, again, this would be something for the LRB A I would say primarily. I mean, it's a pretty good 13 13 or a lawyer to interpret, but the local bet. I can't say for sure. There may be a census 14 14 redistricting in the state should have been block out there that has 2,000 people in it and 15 completed on September 19th, and then after that 15 they may have used it as a ward, but for the most 16 date, if a municipal ward was intersected or 16 part, wards are grouping -- wards are groupings of 17 17 bisected by a congressional or legislative line, blocks. 18 Act 43 or Act 44, then the local municipality 18 Q So wards are groupings of blocks --19 19 would have to go back into WISE-LR or to use the 20 raw census data and split that ward based on that 20 Q -- and then Act 43 and Act 44 follow the census 21 21 lines as well -- census block lines. I should say? assembly district line or congressional line. 22 22 And when I say split, I don't really mean 23 23 Q So if there were a -- if a boundary set by Act 43 split, because the Act 43 and Act 44 data were 24 24 built on blocks. So they would actually be or Act 44 bisected a ward, then what would happen 25 25 as a result of that? With respect to the splitting that ward based on a block. 29 31 1 1 Q When you say block, you mean census block, datasets? 2 correct? 2 A The local municipality, if they were using 3 3 A Census collection block, yep. WISE-LR, they would log into WISE-LR. We had made Q So, again, this is all predicate for what we're 4 changes to the application so that they could look going to get into later, and I want to make sure I at their municipal ward and see it with the 6 6 understand it. When the wards are created by the legislative line running through it, and they 7 local municipality or the county and put into a 7 could either assign a brand new ward number to it, WISE-LR -- put into the WISE-LR database, at that the last sequential number, or they could assign q q part A and part B. That's basically it. point in time are those wards based on census 10 10 ${f Q}$ Have you been through redistricting in Wisconsin data? 11 A Yes. 11 previously? 12 Q Was Act 43 -- Act 43 and Act 44, were those based 12 A Yes. 13 13 Q What was the last time you went through -- well, on census data too? 14 14 A Yes. we know the last time was, if you were involved, 15 Q So if they're both based on census data, then why it would have been 2000, I assume, or 2001?
- 15
- 16 would a ward be split? 17
- A Technically a ward wouldn't be split, but when you
- 18 have a municipality grouping census blocks
- 19 together, before the act is created, there's a
- 20 good possibility that one of their municipal wards
- 21 could have an assembly district line or a
- 22 congressional line running through it. But it
- 23 would be based on blocks. It would be having -
 - if you had a block on this side and a block on
- 25 this side, congressional line running through, if

- 16 A Yep.
- 17 Q Was, after the 2000 decennial census, was that the
- 18 first redistricting in Wisconsin that you were
- 19 involved with?
- 20
- 21 ${f Q}$ Is this the same procedure that was followed after
- 22 the 2000 redistricting?
- 23
- 24 Q Acts 43 and 44 were passed on August 9, 2011,
- 25 correct?

VIDEOTAPE DEPOSITION OF TONY J. VAN DER WIELEN 2/7/2012 A If you say so. Yeah, I -- yes. to all four leaders of the legislature, with the 2 Q Is it your understanding they were passed before 2 block data, and they would have been doing 3 the September deadline for municipalities to have 3 whatever they do. And then when the ward data their wards completed? came on board, when it was finished, then we would 5 5 A Yep. have updated the datasets with the ward 6 Q Were any of the -- strike that question. You information. 7 7 Q Looking back to 2001, do you know whether the mentioned before that the WISE-LR dataset is final statutes that actually put into place the 8 still, it's still being updated; is that correct? 8 A Yep. congressional and assembly district lines, was 10 10 Q Why is it still being updated? that done before or after the process of creating 11 11 A There's approximately 50 wards in the state that wards was completed? 12 12 still need to be split. It's a horrible word in A You know, I would -- I hate to speculate when I 13 13 this sense, but they need to be divided based on a talk about these type of things, especially here, 14 14 congressional or assembly line. Act 43 or Act 44 but I would say the congressional stuff had to be 15 15 line. done based on blocks because of the -- the 16 16 Q So in other words, they are bisected by a deviations were so low. So there's no way, 17 17 congressional or an assembly line and they need to primarily, to get down to that deviation without 18 18 doing it based on census blocks. So I'm assuming be reassigned to a new district; is that correct? 19 the majority of it was done prior to. I don't 19 A They just -- well, you can't have a ward that is 20 intersected by a legislative line because you 20 remember the flow of how the -- how everything was 21 21 passed, but it was -- the congressional lines were can't have one ward voting for two assembly 22 22 districts or two congressional districts, so they enacted by the legislature. 23 23 have to reassign the blocks underneath so that the Q And the assembly lines would have been enacted by 24 24 congressional line is -- so that everybody votes the legislature too? 25 25 A No. in one district or the other. 35 Q And why is that process not complete yet? 1 Q No? They were not -- the court made the decision 1 2 2 A They have until May 15th of 2012, unless in 2001 before the assembly actually passed any 3 3 legislation -- there was some word of legislation statute? 4 moving that date up, but as far as I know, Act 39 A No. The court came out with their plan in 2000 -gives them till May 15th of 2012 to actually do May of 2002. So the statutes would have been the 6 6 that. same when the legislature was drawing their 7 Q Is it fair to say that -- I should -- strike that. 7 legislative districts. I guess, I don't know, if 8 My understanding is that there was a difference in you want to clarify that. I guess I'm a little q q the way that the redistricting was done in 2011 confused by the question. 10 10 Q Well, the question is, were the initial maps, and versus 2001, in the sense that when Acts 43 and 44 11 were being created, when the maps were being 11 this is, again, going back to 2001, were the maps 12 12 created for those, that the process was performed that were prepared initially for the purpose of 13 13 using census blocks rather than wards. Is my accomplishing assembly and congressional districts 14 14 understanding incorrect? in 2001, were those prepared using the same 15 15 A To my knowledge, the federal court drew their process that was used in 2011? 16 16 districts based on the ward information. MR. MCLEOD: I'm going to object to 17 17 Q But not even talking about the district courts, the form of the question because I think it's 18

18 vague and ambiguous. If you can answer it, 19 please do so.

20 A Yeah, I guess, I -- all the data is the same. 21 It's all based on census blocks. It's all based 22 on -- you know, ward data is a collection of 23 census blocks, so it would have been -- they would 24 have used wards to start the redistricting

25 process, but to my knowledge, I don't even

sometime in March. We would have employed

just go back to 2001, when the process was done,

was performed, was it initially performed by the

A It was initially -- well, the process started with

the legislature. It would have been the exact

same process. We would have received census data

redistricting workstations sometime around April

19

20

21

22

23

25

legislature?

1 remember maps coming out of the legislature based date. It would have been early to -- first or 2 2 on that. If maps were built, they would have been second week in November. It was before 3 built on census data, and the census data would 3 Thanksgiving. have been blocks, wards created from WISE-LR, the 4 Q What was the output of the result of the analysis 5 5 first WISE-LR that we created. that you conducted? 6 Q All right. What I'm really -- I'm sorry, I didn't 6 A so the analysis that we did was pretty 7 7 straightforward. We just took a look at the two mean to cut you off. 8 A No, that's fine. 8 datasets, and we found the areas that were Q What I'm trying to figure out was, had the ward 9 assigned to different municipalities, or basically 10 process, the process of the municipalities 10 a, we call them a zone of difference, for lack of 11 11 creating the wards, going all the way through this a better term. The results -- what we did is we 12 12 September 19th date, had that played out in 2001 took the zones of difference or the areas of 13 before the time that the final plans were put into 13 difference that were labeled a different 14 14 place? municipality, and then we geocoded the voter 15 15 A Sure. Yes. I would think they would have been, registration -- not the voter registration system, 16 16 but they would have had data all the way back to but the voter file that we received from GAB as 17 17 March to do whatever they wanted to do with until part of a separate project. We came up with 18 the ward lines came out, and then they may have 18 3.9 million records, approximately, that were 19 adjusted any plans they were creating based on the 19 standardized and geocoded, and then we projected 20 wards that they had received from the WISE-LR 20 those, and then we overlaid those to find the 21 21 dataset. potential voters who may be affected by these 22 22 Q You mentioned that you were asked to do an 23 analysis or comparison of the WISE-LR and adjusted 23 Q So I'm going to back up one second here. So the 24 24 GAB datasets, correct? WISE-LR dataset that's created, this is intended 25 A Yes. 25 to be the dataset that identifies where every 37 39 1 Q So what is the adjusted GAB dataset that you were 1 voter in Wisconsin lives and the districts to 2 2 asked to compare or analyze in comparison to the which they're assigned; is that correct? 3 3 WISE-LR dataset? MR. McLEOD: Object --4 A Well, to my knowledge, the GAB had asked for A No. Q That's not correct? datasets from counties, and they had received 19 6 county datasets. As you can see down below, that 6 MR. McLEOD: Sorry. Object to 7 some of them only gave them municipal wards. Some 7 form. gave them municipal lines. So we had to do quite Q How is my statement incorrect? q a bit of cleanup of the data even to do the 9 A Municipal wards are created based on specific 10 10 analysis that we were talking about. But they statutes that say they have to be of a certain 11 would have asked for data from local officials 11 population range. They're in no way meant to 12 12 that would have been similar, but probably a depict where people live or where they vote. It's 13 13 little bit more spatially accurate from local just a collection of census blocks and population 14 14 officials. totals. 15 15 Q The local official data would have been more Q So WISE-LR does not -- WISE-LR, that dataset does 16 16 spatially accurate? not attempt to assign any voters to any particular 17 17 A It would have been, and there's a lot of factors districts at all; is that correct? 18 18 that go into it. A lot of municipalities have a A It's used for legislative redistricting because 19 smaller geographic area that they're dealing with. 19 the statutes say that we should use the census 20 20 data, because it's the only data tied to census A lot of times they have a little more money, a 21 21 little bit more money that they can put into the population. 22 22 system, so the data is a little bit more spatially Q But WISE -- okay. So, but WISE-LR does not set

23 out where people live or what districts they're 24 assigned to?

25 A It does not. No.

A Sometime in November. I don't know the exact

Q When did the GAB ask you to perform this analysis?

23

25

- Q All right. So --2 A Can I just -- WISE-LR is a free tool that we 3 created at the legislature to help local officials 4 perform their statutory duties. That's it. I 5 mean, a lot of communities didn't have GIS ten 6 years ago, and a lot of people didn't have the 7 ability to even get these requests done. So we 8 created the software so they could group census blocks together based on guidance from the 10 Legislative Reference Bureau so they actually 11 could perform county redistricting and then local 12 redistricting and get the data back to us in time 13 to actually have something to draw legislative 14 districts on. 15 Q So this just outlines, it just outlines the blocks 16 or it's used to be able to develop the boundaries 17 for the different districts?
- 18 A It's not a required software by anybody to use. 19 The counties basically were given an opportunity 20 to use it, and a majority of them did. 21 Q But some didn't. All right. So then the GAB 22 dataset, how did it -- again, what are the 23 discrepancies that exist between the GAB dataset, 24 just broadly speaking, between the GAB dataset and

41

1 A They are some differences in data. You can see 2 the, where the census data may be referenced to a 3 particular area, you can see that there may be a discrepancy between a boundary line. A lot of times you can see where the census actually tried 6 to depict the line that was -- should have been 7 used for a municipal line. It's just, the 8 Census Bureau has a hard time with spatial 9 accuracy because they have so much data. They're 10 mapping everything in the United States down to a 11 dirt road, and for Puerto Rico also. So they have

> So the spatial accuracy is, they tried -- you can tell in a lot of cases where they tried to follow the municipal line, but in some cases it was off a little bit. They're never meant to be lined up together. Census data should be living in census data world, and local data should be living in local data world.

a massive amount of data that they have to deal

with, and it's time and money.

- 21 Q The GAB -- the GAB municipal lines, and I'm 22 looking here at the, maybe it's best to look at 23 reference to -- with reference to Exhibit 148.
- A Sure.

25

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

the WISE-LR?

25 $\boldsymbol{\mathsf{Q}}$ Looking at the first paragraph. The -- did you write this, by the way?

2 A Yes.

 ${f 3}$ ${f Q}$ All right. So you state in the first paragraph 4 The goal of this analysis is to find the

5 approximate number of active registered voters who

6 are located in the difference between the 2011 --

7 I'll just use the acronym there -- WISE-LR data

and the adjusted county data that was submitted to

the Government Accountability Board (GAB)?

active registered voters?

10 A Yep.

15

11 Q All right. So the goal is to find -- the goal is 12 eventually to try to find active registered 13 voters, correct, as you've identified in this 14 paragraph here? Find or identify a number of

16 A Yes. The goal of this document was not for the 17 GAB. The only -- the goal of this document was 18 for us to understand what the GAB was talking 19 about, and if it was a big enough problem to 20 inform legislative leadership because they had 21 not. And that was the goal of this document.

22 Q All right. So we've got -- we've established that 23 under WISE-LR there are boundary lines that are 24 established, right?

25 A Yes.

1

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

25

43

Q So we've got that. Now, you've got a reference 2 here to adjusted county data that was submitted to 3 the GAB?

4 A Yes.

Q All right. Why don't you describe that for me, 6 please.

7 A Okay. So when you create wards in WISE-LR, you're using census blocks. You get population totals 9 from that. So local datasets and local GTS 10 datasets are not tied to population totals at all, 11 so they're just used for everything that a local 12 municipality uses it for, to, you know, plow the 13 streets and, you know, rescue and fire, whatever 14 else they use their datasets for.

> So there is a level -- they have to take the census data, and they're going to have to basically interpret that and make it fit their datasets. It's a pretty basic thing to do in GIS, as far as technicians go. You just have to know your areas. So if there's an area bounded by Main Street and Elm Street and whatever street, you can basically take a look at the census data and you can figure that out using your own datasets.

So that would have been what a county or a

- 1 local municipality would have had to have done if 2 the data didn't line up exactly. They would have 3 had to use some -- a little bit of interpretation to fit the census data into their reality. And so 5 when I say adjusted municipal data, they would 6 have had to base their wards on some type of 7 population total. The only population totals are 8 given through the census. But then they have to adjust those municipal wards to fit their 10 datasets. That's the only way that you can do it. 11 So I'm assuming, because I don't work with 12 the GAB, I don't know how they, you know, exactly 13 how they procured the datasets, all I know is what 14 I had, I'm assuming that's what the local 15 officials had did and given the more spatially 16 accurate data to GAB, and that was the dataset I 17 was comparing, the data that was adjusted by the 18 local municipality to fit census reality against 19 the actual census data. 20 Q And that's population data? 21 A So the census data would have been the only ones 22 that had population totals associated with it. 23 Q The adjustments that are being made though, that 24 you're being asked to look at, are these 25 adjustments of boundary lines?
- 1 A We would look at municipal boundary lines. We 2 would not look at internal -- at the internal 3 lines of a city for this analysis.
- Q So, but for this analysis -- here's the difficulty that I'm having here.
- 6 A Sure.
- 7 Q You mention -- you mention in this paragraph, you say number of active registered voters?
- 9 A Uh-huh.

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

25

- 10 Q So it looks to me like you're looking for people, 11 numbers of people, not specific individual people, 12 but numbers of people?
 - A Well, yeah, it's the only thing to use. I mean, you can't use -- these differences are -- if you look at the areas or if you look at the maps that are contained in that folder, what ended up with this -- the end result of this analysis was a file of difference. So it was areas on a map that we shaded in green. Okay? You don't know what the underlying population is there. There's no way to know, because it would have split multiple census blocks. Census blocks have population contained within them, and if you split that block, there's no way to determine, or at least there's no way for me to determine population of those -- of the

areas, you know, of the split blocks. So the only 2 way to get a number to figure out how many voters 3 potentially that this could affect was to use the 4 geocoded voter file from the GAB, just to get a 5 grasp on how big this problem was.

- 6 Q All right. Again, I'm going to try to summarize 7 here to see if I understand. You'll correct me if 8
- A I'm trying to be as clear as I can.
- 10 Q No, I understand. I understand. And I hope --11 I'm not trying to be frustrating, but --
- 12 A Oh, no, absolutely. I've been answering these 13 questions for a long time, so.
- 14 Q All right. So my understanding is that you've got 15 certain lines, certain boundary lines, ward lines, 16

that come out of the WISE-LR process, correct?

17 A Yes.

1

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

- 18 ${f Q}$ Then those are adjusted or corrected in some way 19 through the use of county data submitted to the 20 GAB, correct?
- 21 A Well, okay, so if I'm Dane County and I log into 22 WISE-LR and I create a ward, and I have my 23 population and my ward is bounded by streets, I 24 have to somehow translate that into this other 25 dataset I have, which is my local dataset, that

47

I've been using for everything, and the two don't necessarily overlay perfectly. It's a common problem in GIS. So datasets were built in different coordinate systems, different areas, and with different specifications.

So basically what the -- the county would have logged in, Dane County, per se, would have logged into WISE-LR, created their wards, but then they had to do some type of adjustment to that ward to fit it into their dataset. So after they created the ward in WISE-LR, they would have to have done some adjustment to that data to fit it into their dataset. After they did that adjustment in their dataset, to kind of translate what they did in WISE-LR over to their county dataset, they would have given that data to the GAB. So, and by just adjusting that data, you're going to come up with these different areas.

So, one of the examples that I, I've heard about. I haven't actually seen, is that there is a road that follows Columbia County and Dane County, and the difference -- there's a difference spatially in the data so that it looks like, when the GAB is doing something, that voters are turning up in Columbia County, but they should be

1 in Dane County. It's really not the case. It's the -- what we used. 2 2 just a difference of where the Census Bureau 3 thought the county line should be and the 3 4 adjustment that had to happen with the local 4 5 dataset. They just don't line up together. They're still the same line, but they shouldn't be 7 7 used together. They should be used in their own, in their own world. So it's a different reality. 8 Q All right. And so the registered voters that A 19 counties, yes. 10 10 you're trying to identify --11 11 A Uh-huh. Yes. 12 Q -- who are located in the difference --13 A Yes. We were --14 14 Q -- so what is that number referring to? 15 A Okay. So the only -- we couldn't do population, 16 16 so we wanted to see how many registered voters, 17 17 active registered voters, I've been told that's 18 18 the correct term to use, with the data we used, we 19 19 geocoded those people, found those areas of 20 difference in the two datasets, and then we 20 21 21 geocoded them, standardized the address and 22 22 geocoded them. We only used geocodes that were 23 23 matched down to an address level match. And then 24 we overlaid those and found, if you turn the page 24 25 25 to page 2, we found that in all the -- the 19 1 1 counties of adjusted data compared to the 19 2 2 counties of WISE-LR data, that 4,204 of those 3 3 active registered voters fell into those difference areas, and that would have been any area of difference, no matter if it was a --6 6 Wisconsin is built in, it's a township range 7 state, so it's built of basically six mile by six 7 were put into place by Act 43 and Act 44? 8 A Yep. mile squares. q 9 Q When was that done? Some of the differences that we were talking 10 10 about were actual gaps between like the township 11

and range. So you could tell where the census created a square, but -- and the locals created a square too, but their squares weren't exactly the same. So there may have been a voter in there. So the 4,204 voters, active registered voters, those were the people that fell within those zones of difference, all of the zones of difference.

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

25

When you start looking at the proximity to an Act 43 line, the number goes down approximately to a fourth of that number. 1,071 people were within about 15 feet of an Act 43 assembly district boundary. We use that number, it's pretty typical number, because when you're using datasets that aren't built off of the same base, you have to calculate for some type of error. And that was

And again, if you look at the Act 44 line, we found approximately 66 voters that fell into those areas of difference that were near a congressional district line, an Act 44 line. Following both, an Act 43 line and an Act 44 line, there were 43. So these are all subsets of that 4,204. Q This was the 19 counties, correct? Q This is as of which date? A Oh, this would have been done in December. This was an internal document that wasn't -- I mean, it was shared with the GAB, but we never knew it would have been shared globally. So there's no date on this document, but it was done in, I believe sometime in early December. Q Have there been additional counties, do you know, that have submitted adjusted data to the GAB? A I don't know. You know, I would assume that all 72 counties would have to go through some type of adjustment. The data the Census Bureau gets is actually data that's given to them by the local officials. Okay. So if -- they would have to do some type of adjustment to it to kind of fit it back into reality. But in the beginning, the data 51 usually comes from the local officials. If the local officials don't give the Census Bureau data, then the Census Bureau has to find different ways of finding where those municipal boundaries are. Q Were you asked to -- you. Was the LTSB asked to

create the maps of the district boundaries that

A The creation of maps?

11 Q Correct.

12 A It would have been as soon as they were enacted 13 and they were published. So we wouldn't release 14 any or produce any maps or post them to the 15 website until after they were enacted and they 16 were actually published. So it would have been 17 sometime in August.

18 Q Those maps that were created, were they created

20 time?

19

24

21 A No. I don't believe so. They were built using 22 census blocks. The first release of WISE-LR data 23 was given to all members of legislative leadership

based on the WISE-LR data that existed at the

 ${f 25}$ ${f Q}$ So it was the census -- the census blocks

on December 5th, I believe. I think so.

1 themselves were the basis for the district existence now under one of these other datasets? 2 2 boundaries under Act 43 and Act 44? A Well, Act 43 and Act 44 are going to follow the 3 A Yes. 3 WISE-LR dataset almost exactly. I mean, in some 4 Q So the map that would have been drawn would have rare cases, that were some municipal annexations 5 just been based on the census blocks? that were put into the application because some 6 A Yes. 6 local officials finished earlier than the 7 Q Are the census blocks, the edges of the census 7 September 19th date. So, but for 99.9 percent of 8 blocks or the boundaries of the census blocks, are 8 them, they fit perfectly. 9 those now, as things stand today, coterminous with Now, the adjusted datasets that you're 10 10 the boundaries of the current WISE-LR dataset? talking about from local officials, that's up for 11 11 A For the most part, yes. interpretation because it's -- the municipal 12 12 Q And when you say -- what's the caveat to for the boundary -- Main Street is Main Street no matter 13 13 most part? if it's in this dataset or that dataset. It 14 14 A Well, we released WISE-LR in March. Local doesn't matter if Main Street is shifted north or 15 15 officials had been using the application for shifted south, it's still Main Street. So if the 16 16 several months, and when the maps were enacted as border of the municipality is Main Street, it's 17 17 of, you know, August 14th or whenever it was and Main Street in the TIGER data and it's Main Street 18 they were published, we would have put the 18 in the local data no matter how it's shifted. 19 19 Act 43 -- well, I'll just step back. Q And now you've just used another term that we saw 20 We released WISE-LR sometime at the end of 20 in the beginning, but you've raised it again now, 21 21 and that's the TIGER data? March. Local officials had been using it for 22 22 A Yes. quite a while, so if they would have created their 23 23 Q And what is the TIGER data? wards based on the prior statute, they would have 24 24 been able to split a municipal block for an A TIGER data is the census data. It's -- there's 25 25 several terms. I mean, census blocks is TIGER. annexation or a detachment. So in some cases that 55 1 1 actually happened. So where a municipality logged Geography is TIGER. Any geography from the U.S. 2 2 into the dataset, they found that the border of Census Bureau is TIGER. 3 let's say Whitewater had changed due to an 3 Q So now we've talked about boundaries under these 4 annexation that occurred on or before April -- it two different datasets. would have been August 1st, 2011, so they would A Yep. 6 6 Q Now, we haven't -- we've mentioned registered have actually been able to, in the WISE-LR 7 application, select the block, draw the new 7 voters. We haven't sort of gone back and talked 8 municipal boundary, and whatever population was in about any potential impact on registered voters, q that block would have been divided in WISE-LR 9 or at least I haven't intended to do that just at 10 10 based on their estimate of people on one side of this point yet. That is something that I want to 11 the block or the other. 11 do, but I'd like to first work our way through the 12 12 So there are some differences to it. Local rest of the documents that you've provided. 13 13 officials, some local officials had already A Sure. Absolutely. 14 14 finished the whole process of local redistricting Q So I want to come back to that. 15 15 before the maps were enacted. All right. On to paragraph number 8 --16 16 Q Some municipalities had finished the process actually, with paragraph number 7, let me make 17 17 sure that I've finished that up. That analysis is before the maps were enacted, correct? 18 18 A Yep. the first two pages of Exhibit No. 148 --19 Q But not all? 19 A Uh-huh. 20 20 A Not all, no. Q -- is that correct? Was there anything else 21 21 within paragraph number 7 that was -- that's Q And really, what I'm trying to figure out is 22 22 whether the boundaries that are created -provided on the flash drive, or it was just these legislative district boundaries that are created 23 23 by Acts 43 and 44 are different than the 24 A Just those two pages. Like I said, I -- this --25 25 boundaries that are created or that are in the rest of this document --

```
Q Exhibit 148 you're talking about?
                                                                        the record?
 2 A Right. Pages 2 through 9?
                                                             2
                                                                                MR. POLAND: Yeah, let's go off the
    Q Uh-huh.
                                                             3
                                                                        record.
    A This was an analysis, it must have been done by
                                                                                    (Recess)
 5
       the GAB, because I don't know what these numbers
                                                                            (Exhibit No. 149 marked for
 6
                                                                             identification)
       mean, and I looked at this analysis before, but
 7
                                                             7
       this is not something we would have done, and I'm
                                                                By Mr. Poland:
 8
       not quite sure what it means, and I have no idea
                                                             8
                                                                Q Mr. Van Der Wielen, I'm handing you a copy of a
       why LTSB's name is on this, so.
                                                                    document that we've marked as Exhibit No. 149.
10
                                                            10
    Q That's fine. Well, we have a GAB witness that
                                                                    This is going to circle back just a little bit to
11
                                                            11
       we're deposing tomorrow, so we can ask him about
                                                                    what we were going over a couple of minutes ago.
12
       this.
                                                            12
                                                                    You were referring to maps, I think, that had been
                                                            13
13
   A Okay.
                                                                   printed out with green-shaded areas. Do you
14
                                                            14
    Q All right. You can set that to the side then.
                                                                    recall that when we were discussing that?
15
       Turning your attention back to Exhibit No. 146,
                                                            15 A Yep.
16
                                                            16
                                                                Q So I'm going to circle back now and try to
       which is your response.
17
                                                            17
    A Yep.
                                                                    understand the differences here with respect to
18
    Q Paragraph number 8, you state you've included a
                                                            18
                                                                   Exhibit No. 149. Can you identify Exhibit 149 for
19
                                                            19
       PowerPoint that was created for Wisconsin
20
       Redistricting Road Shows. It shows and explains
                                                            20
                                                                A Well, that's a portion of a map that we produced
21
                                                            21
                                                                    for the analysis that LTSB, the analysis of
       some improvements and some errors in the U.S.
22
                                                            22
       Census Bureau's TIGER datasets?
                                                                    WISE-LR and adjusted GAB datasets. That's what it
23
   A Yep.
                                                            23
                                                                    is. Do you want me to explain it?
24
                                                            24
    Q Just generally speaking, and we don't have the
                                                                Q Yeah, if you could. Well, I see a number -- so
25
                                                            25
       documents in front of us, but what are the
                                                                    there are a number of different things going on in
                           57
                                                                                       59
1
       improvements and errors that you're referring to?
                                                             1
                                                                    this map, right? So we have some different
 2
    A I've seen some -- the Census Bureau went through a
                                                             2
                                                                    colored lines, correct?
 3
       major modernization process, back in 2004, where
                                                             3 A Uh-huh.
 4
       the spatial accuracy of their datasets actually
                                                                Q So I see one line that is a solid red line.
       increased quite a bit, or their target for spatial
                                                                A Okay.
 6
                                                             6
                                                                Q This is in the, I guess it's progressively zoomed
       accuracy increased quite a bit. So I've heard a
 7
       lot of numbers tossed around, I think plus or
                                                             7
                                                                    in on an area; is that fair to say?
       minus 50 feet or something, but actually it's
 q
       quite a bit better than that now. It's, and I
                                                             9
                                                                Q Now, so I'm looking on the bottom half of the
10
                                                            10
       don't have the document in front of me, but it's,
                                                                    page, at the photo there.
11
       I think it's 7 meters or something to that effect.
                                                            11
                                                                A Yep.
                                                            12
12
    Q This may be a document -- let me just check my
                                                                Q And I'm looking at a line that's a solid red line.
13
                                                            13
                                                                    What is the solid red line?
       stack of materials that were produced by the GAB.
14
                                                            14
                                                                A That is a -- that's the census designation for the
    A Actually the number in there isn't correct, so.
                                                            15
15
    Q Pardon?
                                                                    town of Harmony.
16
    A The number in the GAB documents are not correct.
                                                            16
                                                                Q So that's where the census depicts the border of
17
                                                            17
       They reference plus or minus something, but it's
                                                                    the town of Harmony as being?
18
                                                            18
       not as -- it's actually more than that.
                                                                A Yes.
19
                                                                Q Then I see another line that is an orange line.
    Q I wanted to see if I had that road show document
                                                            19
20
                                                            20
       in here that I could mark as an exhibit.
                                                                    What is the orange line?
21
    A Okav.
                                                            21
                                                                A That is the representation of the town of Harmony
22
                                                            22
                    MR. POLAND: Let me take two
                                                                   by Rock County.
23
                                                            23
                                                                Q Then I see another line, it looks like a
           minutes, because I think I have it
24
           downstairs. Let me go down and grab it.
                                                            24
                                                                    multicolored line, it looks like it's purple and
25
                                                            25
                    MR. McLEOD: We're going to go off
                                                                   blue, and there might be another color too in
```

What is that line? voters that are contained within the boundaries of 2 2 A Those are the Act 43 and Act 44 lines. what are identified, on this exhibit at least, as $\boldsymbol{\mathsf{Q}}\,$ So if I'm looking at this correctly, it would 3 being assembly or congressional district appear that, first of all, we've got a boundaries; is that correct? 5 discrepancy, if I can use that term, between where A I guess, can you say that again? Q Sure. the census data and the Rock County data say the 7 7 town of Harmony boundary is; is that fair to say? A Can I look at what you're referencing? A Yeah. That's fair to say. Q I see two black dots --Q All right. And the, what does the green-shaded A Yep. 10 10 area attempt to capture? Q -- that are down in the lower right-hand corner, 11 11 A So the green-shaded areas on the map are the areas that appear to be located within an area that's 12 12 of difference between the local -- or the Rock identified as being the assembly and congressional 13 13 County municipal layer and the, in this case, district boundaries? 14 14 A Yep. census-based WISE-LR data, the municipal layer for 15 the census-based WISE-LR dataset. 15 Q The other dots -- one, two, three, four, five, 16 16 Q And there are a number of black dots up in the six, seven, eight -- nine or so, appear to fall 17 17 green-shaded area, correct? outside of that -- of those district boundaries --18 A Yes. 18 A Right. 19 19 Q What do those black dots represent? Q -- that are depicted on here; is that correct? 20 A Those are the geocoded active registered voters. 20 A Yep. 21 21 Q Were you finished with your answer? Q So I want to focus on the two that appear to be 22 22 A Yeah. Yep. inside the dotted lines. 23 23 Q So from your analysis, you identified, just in A Okay. 24 Exhibit 149, it would appear -- one, two, three, 24 Q Or the multicolored lines. All right. Does the 25 25 four, five, six, seven, eight, nine, ten -- 11, location of those dots either inside or outside of 61 63 1 11 voters who lived in this area of difference or 1 those -- the boundaries, the assembly and 2 2 discrepancy between town of Harmony boundaries as congressional district boundaries depicted on 3 3 Exhibit 149, does that have any impact on their determined by the census data and by Rock County? A Approximately. I mean, there could be some that 4 district assignments? are stacked on top of each other, and that's just A I have no idea. The only person that could answer 6 6 one of the things that happens when you geocode that would be the local clerk or the GAB at this 7 7 point. That wasn't the analysis that we did. people. So there may be more. Q Now, I notice that the multicolored lines appear 8 Q Once you had identified these green-shaded areas to be over the solid red line -q and the black dots within them, what did you do 10 10 A Uh-huh. with that information? 11 Q -- in part, correct? 11 A We gave it to leadership. 12 A Yes. 12 Q That was given to the legislative leadership? 13 13 Q And then it also -- then also follow the solid --A Uh-huh. 14 14 Q And to the GAB as well? there's a solid blue line on here as well, 15 correct? 15 A We, we had a -- once we did the analysis, we met 16 16 A Yeah. with the GAB to tell them what we found, and 17 17 Q That's a road; is that right? basically that's this information, this analysis, 18 18 A Those are actually the divisions of census blocks, which is the first two pages of Exhibit 148 --19 the blue lines. 19 Q Right. 20 20 Q The blue lines are the division of census blocks, A -- in that we let them know that if -- we let them 21 21 okav. know that we were going to inform leadership. 22 22 A Right. And they do coincide with the roads, the Q So trying to tie together the map, which is 23 23 centerline of the road. Exhibit 149, together with the first two pages of Q Now, again, if I'm reading this correctly, it 24 Exhibit 148 --25 25 A Yep. would appear that there are approximately two

 ${f Q}$ -- which is the analysis, in the second page that A Excellent. 2 you had prepared of Exhibit 148 --Q Yes. All right. 3 A Yep. MR. KELLY: We'll see about that. 4 Q -- the voter selection section, these black dots 4 Q All right. At the next step. 5 that are represented on the map, those would have A It is, the map actually is a little -- because 6 there are, the two maps up here do show what the been captured within the first paragraph, voters 7 7 that are affected by the differences between GAB census data looks like and then what the local 8 and WISE-LR data? R data looks like and then a combination of them A Yep. both. So it is a little taken out of context, but 10 ${f Q}$ What about the second enumerated group, voters 10 yes, so I think you had been able to --11 11 affected by differences between GAB and WISE-LR Q By taken out of context, do you --12 12 data and in a contiguous different zone? A It's a little harder to actually interpret this 13 13 A I believe they would have. I don't know, I would map without seeing the whole picture. 14 14 Q Yes. Yeah. Understood. All right. have to look at the data to make sure, but we 15 15 would have used the -- when we talk about Back to Exhibit 146, which is just your 16 16 contiguous different zones, we're actually talking enumeration of materials you provided. 17 17 about areas of this green that are within 15 feet A Sure. Absolutely. 18 18 of a line, so I'm assuming that those two would Q Number 8 is the PowerPoint, and I took a quick 19 19 have been counted in both the -- or in all of look at that on the flash drive. 20 them, actually. Those two dots would be 20 A Okay. 21 21 Q I want to take a look at that myself. represented by all four of those sections. 22 22 A Okay. Because there's a congressional line. There is an 23 assembly line. It's within a zone of difference. 23 Q Number, paragraph number 9, I did want to ask you 24 24 And that's one of the voters that was geocoded about. We asked the question, we asked you to 25 25 provide any materials related to estimates or there. 65 67 1 1 Q But at that point, your role in this analysis, discussions of the total population of the areas 2 2 LTSB's role in this analysis ended and you passed affected by the misalignment of municipal 3 that off to GAB? 3 boundaries and legislative and congressional A Yeah, the only thing, we identified the areas, we 4 districts and the effects this has had or may have tried to figure out the scope of what they were on the respective population of affected or 6 6 talking about, but we have no idea what they would potentially affected legislative and congressional 7 have actually done with anybody who fell into this 7 districts. Your response said, "I have nothing for this request. There is no way to estimate the 9 Q And do you know, focusing on those two dots that 9 total population affected." 10 10 we had identified, do you know whether those two A Right. 11 dots, which represent registered voters, do you 11 Q I wanted to ask you to explain the second part of 12 12 know which district they would have been counted that response, "There is no way to estimate the 13 13 as being in under Act 43 and Act 44? total population affected." Why is that? 14 A I have no idea. We don't deal with registered 14 A There's a lot of factors that go into it. It 15 voters. We only deal with census population. 15 could be, like we were talking about, the 16 Q Got it. Okay. 16 adjustment of those lines would need to happen, so 17 17 A We would have -- in this case, if someone from if, you know, if Main Street were here in the 18 18 that house, per se, would have called LTSB and census data and Main Street were here, you would 19 19 assume they were talking about the same said, I'm trying to figure out what my Act 43 or 20 20 Main Street, so there really would be no Act 44 line, what district I would be in, we would 21 21 have said to call your local clerk. population affected there, it would just be a 22 22 Q All right. All right. Understood. The picture shift in the dataset, in two datasets that weren't 23 23 did help. meant to be overlaid. So that's one reason why. 24 24 A Okay. Good. Another reason why is local datasets are not

25

tied to population totals at all. So there's no

25

Q Helped me at least.

```
1
       way to represent total population by looking at a
                                                                    leadership through this memo that there may be
 2
                                                             2
       parcel or by looking at a -- any form of local
                                                                    some problems.
 3
       dataset, that I know of. So the only population
                                                                Q All right. I'd like to --
 4
       totals can be derived from the U.S. Census
                                                                A That they're trying to do.
 5
       Bureau's data, and that data would have had to
                                                                Q I'd like to draw your attention to the last two
 6
       have been, I mean, if you're looking at this
                                                                    sentences in Exhibit 150.
 7
                                                             7 A Uh-huh.
       dataset laid on top of the other dataset, you
 8
       would have to intersect thousands of blocks and
                                                             8
                                                                Q There is first the statement that says, "GAB will
       you would have to figure out, you know, where the
                                                                    assign every registered voter to a legislative and
10
                                                            10
       population actually was, and that would have to be
                                                                   congressional district." Do you see that
11
                                                            11
       determined probably by local clerks.
                                                                   statement?
12
                                                            12
                                                                A Uh-huh.
           But again, I don't think that's the way to
13
       look at this. Some of the errors -- or not even
                                                            13
                                                                Q Is it your understanding that as of January 3rd,
                                                            14
14
       errors. Some of the differences between the
                                                                   GAB intended to assign every registered voter to a
15
                                                            15
       datasets are pretty nominal, and it's just an
                                                                    legislative and congressional district?
16
                                                            16
       interpretation that needs to take effect. So
                                                               A T believe so.
17
       there's no data to estimate population totals. It
                                                            17
                                                                Q All right. Then the next sentence states, "These
18
                                                            18
       just can't be done.
                                                                   may not be the same districts to which the voter
    Q All right. And then paragraph number -- you have
                                                            19
19
                                                                   was assigned by Acts 43 and 44." Do you see that
20
       given your responses to paragraphs 10 and 11, and
                                                            20
                                                                    sentence?
21
                                                            21
                                                                A Uh-huh.
       I'd like to move on to paragraph number 12 of your
22
                                                            22
                                                                Q Is it your understanding that GAB in fact has
       response. You've stated, "I have placed two memos
23
                                                            23
                                                                   assigned voters to legislative and congressional
       that were given to legislative leadership and any
24
                                                            24
       related e-mails in this folder," and then you've
                                                                   districts that are now different than the
25
                                                            25
       got two subparagraphs where you identify two
                                                                   districts that the voters were assigned to under
                          69
                                                                                       71
1
       memos. You have a January 3rd, 2012 memo. I'm
                                                             1
                                                                   Acts 43 and 44?
 2
       just going to go ahead and mark that here.
                                                             2 A I believe that's the case. I mean, we -- there's
 3
                    MR. POLAND: That's Exhibit 150?
                                                             3
                                                                    a document prior to this that I included questions
                    THE COURT REPORTER: Uh-huh.
                                                                   for the GAB, and to which we outlined very
               (Exhibit No. 150 marked for
                                                                   explicit questions to them and they answered that.
 6
                                                             6
                   identification)
                                                                   I don't have that document in front of me, so I
 7
    Q Mr. Van Der Wielen, I'm handing you a document
                                                                    can't really answer those questions. It's in the
 8
       that we've marked as Exhibit No. 150. Is this a
                                                                    flash drive.
 q
       copy of the memorandum that you have identified in
                                                             9
                                                                Q Do you know which number it was responsive to?
10
                                                            10
       your response to paragraph 12?
                                                                A Sure. 6.
11
                                                            11
                                                                Q You think you can answer that question better if I
12
                                                            12
    Q Can you identify this document for the record,
                                                                   put that document in front of you?
13
                                                            13
                                                                A If I could, yeah. That would be excellent.
       please?
14
                                                                Q Yeah, let me do that. Yes.
                                                            14
   A It's the memorandum that was created by LTSB and
                                                            15
15
       LRB and was given to legislative leadership on
                                                                                MR. POLAND: Give me two minutes.
16
       January 3rd.
                                                            16
                                                                                THE WITNESS: Okay.
17
                                                            17
    Q Did you assist in the preparation of this memo?
                                                                                    (Recess)
18
                                                            18
                                                                            (Exhibit No. 151 marked for
19
    Q Who asked that this memo, Exhibit 150, be prepared
                                                            19
                                                                             identification)
20
                                                            20 Q Mr. Van Der Wielen, just before we took a brief
       or created?
21
                                                            21
                                                                   break there, we were talking about Exhibit
    A Based on the conversations that we had with
22
                                                            22
                                                                   No. 150 --
       Government Accountability Board, they did not
23
                                                            23 A Yep.
       inform our legislative leaders of some of the
       problems they were having, so we did the analysis
                                                            24
                                                                Q -- which is a January 3rd memo, and you referred
25
                                                            25
       that we talked about prior, and then we informed
                                                                    to questions for the GAB that was a document that
```

you produced today; is that correct? Q The answer was yes, the lines would change? 2 A Yes. A Yes. 3 Q I'm handing you a copy of a document that we've Q Who gave you that answer? marked as Exhibit No. 151, and is that the A Ross Hein. 5 questions for the GAB document you were talking Q Who is Mr. -- I'm sorry, Hein or Heim? A I think it's Hein. about a minute ago? 7 A Yes. Q Hein? Okay. Q Would you identify that document please? A I think it's H-e-i-n. There's --A It's a document we created, questions that we Q Who does Mr. Hein work for? 10 10 wanted to ask the GAB before we informed A The Government Accountability Board. 11 11 leadership. We wanted to make sure that we knew Q Did Mr. Hein tell you in what way it would change 12 exactly what they were talking about before we -assembly or congressional lines? 13 Q Sorry. Just finish. 13 14 14 Q When did you have that conversation or A Oh, no -- before we informed leadership. 15 Q When was Exhibit 151 prepared? communication with Mr. Hein where he told you that 16 16 A It would have been first week in December, the lines would change? 17 17 somewhere around there. I don't have the exact A It was a meeting with the LRB, LTSB, and the 18 date. It would have been prepared for the meeting 18 Government Accountability Board. I don't know the 19 19 with the GAB right before we informed leadership. exact date, but the meeting notice is actually 20 Q Looking at the very first question on Exhibit 20 included in the e-mails on the flash drive. 21 21 Q When did the meeting occur? No. 151 -- actually, before I ask you that 22 22 question, let me ask you, who actually prepared A Sometime in December, before the holiday. It 23 23 Exhibit 151? would have been the first week or two of December. 24 A LTSB. This would have been myself and the --Q The second question that -- actually let me back 25 25 Jeff, my director, and -- it would have been with up. Did you ever see any kind of a representation 73 75 1 the LRB too. 1 or hear any kind of a representation of how the 2 2 Q When you say Jeff -lines would change? 3 A Jeff Ylvisaker. A No. Q Ylvisaker. I've seen the name written, but I Q Next question, "Specifically, will it change haven't heard it pronounced, so I appreciate that. legislative district population totals?" 6 6 A Uh-huh. A Sure. 7 Q Looking at the very first question that you had Q Do you see that? written down for GAB's staff, the question is, A Yep. q "Will the process dealing with census blocks Q Did you ever receive a response to that question? 10 10 conflicting with municipal boundaries, documented A Yes. 11 in the attached memorandum dated November 10th, 11 Q And what was the response to that question? 12 12 2011, change assembly or congressional lines A Yes. 13 13 outlined in 2011 Wisconsin Acts 43 and 44? Q Was that for Mr. Hein? 14 14 Specifically, will it change legislative district A It was -- yes, it was from him specifically. 15 15 population totals?" Sarah Whitt was there and also -- I can't remember 16 Now, I'd like to actually break that out and 16 his name. He would be in the meeting notice too, 17 17 ask that in two parts. The first question that but it was one of the election administrators, I 18 18 you ask, asks whether assembly or congressional believe, and David Meyer I believe too. 19 lines outlined in 2011 Wisconsin Acts 43 and 44 19 Q Of the LTSB? 20 20 will change; do you see that? A Of GAB. 21 A Uh-huh. 21 Q Or GAB. Getting my acronyms confused here. 22 A Yeah. 22 Q Did you ever receive an answer to that question? 23 23 Q All right. Do you -- were you told how Q What was the answer? 24 legislative district population totals would

change?

25

25 A Yes.

```
inaccuracy in the GAB memo dated
 2
    Q Did you ever see any kind of a visual
                                                             2
                                                                    January 13th, 2012. Do you see that?
 3
       representation of how they would change?
                                                             3
                                                                A Yep.
                                                                                MR. POLAND: Let's go ahead and
 5
                                                             5
    Q Was LTSB asked to do any additional follow-up on
                                                                        mark this document for the record.
       those two questions that you posed?
                                                                            (Exhibit No. 152 marked for
 7
                                                             7
   A No. Again, I mean, we identified the difference
                                                                             identification)
       areas, but we have no idea what they were doing in
                                                                Q Mr. Van Der Wielen, the court reporter has handed
       those areas.
                                                                    you a copy of a document that has been marked as
10
                                                            10
                                                                    Exhibit 152. Do you have that in front of you?
    Q At that point in time --
                                                            11
11
    A so.
12
                                                            12
    Q -- you handed it off to the GAB, you had
                                                                Q Is that the document identified in paragraph 12(b)
                                                            13
13
       responded, and then from that point on it was
                                                                    of Exhibit 146?
14
       GAB's issue to deal with?
                                                            14
                                                                A Yep.
15
    A Kind of. I mean, we had our own motivation here.
                                                                Q Now, that refers to a January 13th memo as well,
16
       It was just to let leadership know the scope of
                                                            16
                                                                    correct?
17
                                                            17
       the problem and figure out what was going on. It
                                                                A Yes.
18
                                                            18
                                                                Q We've already marked that as an exhibit. Let me
       wasn't really something done for GAB or, it was
                                                            19
19
       done to let leadership know that there was a
                                                                    get that out here so that we've got that in front
20
       problem, what the scope of the problem was, and
                                                            20
                                                                    of us as well. I'm going to hand you a copy of
21
                                                            21
       just to identify some areas where they may be
                                                                    that.
                                                            22 A Sure.
22
       doing something, but we don't know what they're
23
                                                            23
                                                                Q The staple is a little sharp in the back.
24
    Q Was Exhibit No. 150, which is the January 3rd
                                                            24
                                                                A Okay.
25
                                                            25
       memo, was that the communication by which you let
                                                                Q As you can see, the document that I've just handed
                           77
                                                                                       79
1
                                                             1
       the legislative leadership know --
                                                                    to you is marked as Deposition Exhibit No. 80, if
 2 A Yes.
                                                             2
                                                                    you look in the lower right-hand corner of the
    Q -- what was going on?
                                                             3
 3
                                                                    document; do you see that?
    A Yep.
                                                                A Yep.
    Q After the point that the January 3rd memorandum
                                                                Q And you'll see that's a memorandum dated
 6
                                                                    January 13th, 2012?
       was written, did LTSB have any further involvement
 7
       in trying to determine whether assembly or
                                                                A Uh-huh.
       congressional lines would change and how or
                                                                Q Is that the document that you were referring to in
 q
       whether legislative district population totals
                                                             q
                                                                    your response to our subpoena?
                                                            10
10
       would change and how?
                                                                A Yes.
11
    A No. No. We deal with the census -- since
                                                            11
                                                                Q All right. So we've got the two, we've got the
12
                                                            12
       November, we've received over a hundred e-mails
                                                                    January 23rd memo, and then the January 13th memo
13
                                                            13
                                                                    in front of us, correct?
       trying to correct ward layers, just with technical
14
                                                            14
       errors. All those e-mails have been included on
                                                                A Uh-huh.
15
       the flash drive, with GAB, working with
                                                            15
                                                                Q Would you please explain to me how the
                                                            16
16
       Sarah Whitt and David Meyer and David Grassel,
                                                                    January 23rd memo seeks to clarify an inaccuracy
17
                                                            17
       just trying to get data from local officials into
                                                                    in the January 13th memo?
18
                                                            18
       their system. But having to deal with any of
                                                                A Well, on page 4 of the GAB memo states that, "In
19
                                                            19
                                                                    fact, LTSB conducted a limited analysis of 19
       these things, no.
20
                                                            20
    Q Set those two exhibits, 150 and 151 to the side,
                                                                    counties comparing the circumference of municipal
21
                                                            21
       please.
                                                                    boundaries from the WISE-LR maps to the
22
                                                            22
    A Okay.
                                                                    circumference of municipal boundaries in county
                                                            23
23
    Q I'd like to move to Exhibit 146, and the last
                                                                    shapefile maps as they relate to legislative and
       document that you have identified in paragraph
                                                            24
                                                                    congressional districts" --
25
                                                            25 Q I'm sorry, where are you reading from?
       12(b) is a memo that you say seeks to clarify an
```

A I'm sorry. I am reading -- I can read from either it wasn't to go further and make -- draw 2 2 document, because we just copied exactly from conclusions about changes in assembly districts or 3 there, but it would be on page -- 1, 2, 3 -- 4, 3 district lines or boundaries or -paragraph -- one, two -- three of the GAB memo 4 A Right. 5 dated January 13th. Q -- any of the other conclusions that are 6 ${f Q}$ So the January 13th memo, we're on page 4, and you attributed to LTSB? 7 7 A Right. It was just to understand the problem, said we're in the --8 A Third paragraph. 8 figure out the scope of what they were reporting, Q Third paragraph down? 9 and notify leadership. If this were one or two 10 10 A Uh-huh. voters in a very small area, we probably wouldn't 11 11 Q All right. Now, and then in the January 23rd have even notified leadership about this. But 12 12 memo, that paragraph is set out? because of the scope of it, we did. 13 13 Q Whose decision was it to notify legislative 14 Q All right. All right. Great. I'm with you now. 14 leadership on January 3rd? 15 All right, please continue. 15 A I think it was a group decision by LTSB and LRB, 16 16 Steve Miller and Jeff Ylvisaker. A Sorry. 17 Q That's okay. 17 Q Was GAB involved in that decision to inform 18 A All right. So in fact -- the GAB states in the 18 legislative leadership? 19 memo, "In fact, the LTSB conducted a limited 19 A We asked them to, and they asked us to do it. 20 analysis of 19 counties comparing the 20 Q Do you know why GAB didn't do that themselves? 21 21 A I don't know. I -circumference of municipal boundaries from the 22 22 Q Did they ever tell you why they didn't want to --WISE-LR map to the circumference of municipal 23 23 boundaries in county shapefile maps as they relate didn't notify legislative leadership? 24 to legislative and congressional districts" --24 A There was some discussion at the meeting about 25 25 Q I'm going to ask you -- sorry, I'm going to ask that, but I think it was just because they had a 83 1 you just to slow down a little bit just because 1 lot of other stuff going on and that would have 2 the court reporter has to type this --2 just been another thing that they were dealing 3 A Oh, I'm sorry. 3 with leadership on --Q -- as you're reading it, so. All right. Please Q They've been -continue. A -- that was complicated. 6 A Sure. All right -- "congressional districts and Q They've been quite busy lately? 7 concluded that 4,204 voters were affected by incorrect municipal boundaries, 1,071 of which Q Who was at the December meeting that you had with q likely change assembly districts and 66 of which q the GAB, who from the GAB was there? 10 10 likely change congressional districts." A It would be in that e-mail folder with all the 11 And again, the memo from the 23rd, we want to 11 recipients, but from my recollection, it was 12 12 clarify that because, "LTSB did perform a limited Ross Hein, it was Sarah Whitt, David Meyer, and 13 13 analysis based on data from GAB but did not there was one other gentleman, dark hair, dark 14 14 conclude that certain voters were affected by curly hair, and I just don't remember his name. 15 incorrect municipal boundaries, nor did LTSB 15 Q We'll be able to find it when we look in the files 16 conduct -- conclude that certain voters would 16 that you provided in the flash drive; is that 17 17 likely change assembly or senate district. LTSB correct? 18 18 only estimated the scope of GAB's reported problem A Yeah, and I think actually, I thought his name 19 before bringing it to legislative leadership's 19 might have been in one of these memos, but --20 20 attention." Q Was it potentially one of the lawyers, do you 21 21 Q So in other words, if I can summarize, essentially know, one of the staff counsel? 22 22 A Could have been. there, what the memo is stating is what you've 23 23 testified to here today, which is that LTSB's Q Shane Falk? objective, goal, mission, whatever you want to 24 A Yeah, that sounds really familiar. Could have 25 25 been Shane. I think Shane was present at a couple call it, was simply to identify the problem, and

```
of those meetings.
                                                                    SVRS at all?
 2
    Q Had you -- turning to Exhibit No. 80 again, that's
                                                             2
                                                                A No.
 3
       the January 13th memo, is that a document that you
                                                             {f 3} {f Q} The next statement, next sentence reads, "In
       had seen before?
                                                              4
                                                                    addition, these corrections also require splitting
 5
                                                             5
    A It is. This was forwarded to me before our
                                                                    census blocks, which may conflict with Act 39's
       initial meeting with the GAB in November. It was
                                                              6
                                                                    prohibition on splitting census blocks." Do you
 7
                                                             7
       forwarded to me just a -- I was out sick on
                                                                    see that?
 8
       Friday. I think it was forwarded to me the Friday
                                                             8
                                                                A Uh-huh.
       before the meeting. We had the meeting on Monday.
                                                                 Q Did you ever address or encounter the question of
10
                                                             10
       So it was kind of an afterthought that was
                                                                    whether splitting census blocks may conflict with
       forwarded over to us. So I had limited reading of
11
                                                             11
                                                                    Act 39's prohibition on splitting census blocks?
12
       it. It goes through lengths of talking about some
                                                                 A Can you say that again?
                                                             13
13
       things in here that --
                                                                 Q Sure.
                                                             14
14
    Q All right. I'd like to turn your attention to
                                                                                 MR. POLAND: Actually could you
15
                                                             15
       page 4 of Exhibit 80.
                                                                        read the question back.
16
                                                             16
    A Okav.
                                                                                 (Question read)
17
                                                             17
    Q And if you look, down toward the bottom of page 4,
                                                                 A Under no circumstance, under any statute, I
18
                                                             18
                                                                    believe, and again, I would ask Mike Keane at the
       you'll see five enumerated paragraphs, 1, 2, 3, 4,
                                                             19
19
       and 5. Do you see those?
                                                                    LRB this before I would talk to anybody about
20
    A Uh-huh.
                                                             20
                                                                    this, but the census blocks are not allowed to be
21
                                                            21
    Q Has anybody ever told you that those statements
                                                                    split at all unless there's an annexation involved
22
                                                             22
       made in those five numbered paragraphs are not
                                                                    and -- or a detachment, and even Act 39 -- Act 39
23
                                                             23
       correct?
                                                                    actually backed that data up to April 1st, 2010.
24
    A I have no idea what they're referencing. I mean,
                                                             24
                                                                    So we would have never said it was okay to split a
25
                                                             25
       if you look at these 1,266 registered voters were
                                                                    census block. I mean, only under certain
                                                                                       87
1
                                                             1
                                                                    circumstances that allow it, but -- and the GIS
       placed in the wrong municipality in the WISE-LR
 2
       maps, I don't know what that -- I don't know what
                                                             2
                                                                    manager are more technical in nature. I mean, if
 3
       analysis they conducted. I don't know how they
                                                             3
                                                                    the LRB said a community could split a census
       did their analysis. I don't know how they
                                                                    block for a certain reason, then they would call
       geocoded their voters. I have no idea how they
                                                                    me and I would help them technically get that
                                                             6
       came up with those numbers.
                                                                    done, so.
 7
    Q All right. That's fair enough.
                                                             7
                                                                 Q Understood. And then I would like to your
    A So. So no, I couldn't speak to those numbers at
                                                                    attention to page 7 of Exhibit 80.
 q
       all.
                                                             9
                                                                 A Okav.
                                                             10
10
    Q All right. I'd like to draw your attention to
                                                                 Q You'll see a caption or a heading that says GAB
11
       page 5?
                                                             11
                                                                    Action Plan; do you see that?
12
                                                             12
    A Okay.
                                                                 A Uh-huh.
13
                                                             13
    Q There is a section, about the middle of the page,
                                                                 Q And I'd like to draw your attention to the last
14
                                                             14
       that states Districts Created by Acts 43 and 44
                                                                    sentence of that first big blocked paragraph
15
       and Conflict With Act 39; do you see that? That
                                                             15
                                                                    there, and that sentence states, "Regardless of
16
       heading? It's a heading, it's a bold heading?
                                                             16
                                                                    when these corrections occur," open paren,
17
                                                             17
   A Yes. T see it.
                                                                    "pre-spring 2012 election or after," closed paren,
18
                                                             18
    Q The second paragraph under that section?
                                                                    "it is likely that the final districts will not
19
                                                             19
    A Okay.
                                                                    strictly match those prescribed by Acts 43 and 44
                                                            20
20
    Q You see that it states, "After the GAB and/or
                                                                    because census blocks were attributed to incorrect
21
                                                             21
       local clerks made these" -- "make these
                                                                    municipalities or voting districts." Do you see
22
                                                            22
       corrections, the districts in SVRS may not match
                                                                    that?
23
                                                            23
       Acts 43 and 44 precisely." Do you see that?
24
    A Yep.
                                                             24
                                                                 Q Did you have a conversation with anybody about
25
                                                            25
    Q Do you have -- does LTSB have anything to do with
                                                                    that particular conclusion or statement?
```

A I mean, in general, sure. Yeah, I mean, we've had court in this proceeding, and so we're going to 2 conversations about that. The -- there's a 2 have to explain not only to us lawyers but also to 3 premise there that I don't agree with that 3 the federal judges, who might not be familiar with statement per se. I mean -the redistricting process in Wisconsin, what --5 5 Q And what is it that you don't agree with as a who some of the people are and some of the 6 premise? organizations. When you say we asked for this 7 7 A Census blocks were attributed to incorrect working group to be created, is that LTSB that asked for it to be created? 8 municipal or voting districts. In the context of 8 9 the census, they weren't. They were attributed 9 A Technically -- or the bureaus of the legislature 10 10 correctly by the municipalities. It's only when would have asked for this to be created, the LRB 11 11 they're adjusted that they may have -- they may and the LTSB. 12 12 not have matched the municipal or voting Q We don't have an LRB witness, I think, that will 13 13 districts. It's that process of adjustment that be testifying, so could you please describe what 14 14 may have -- it's not the census data. They would the LRB is just very briefly? 15 have been attributed correctly using the WISE-LR 15 A It's the Legislative Reference Bureau. They would 16 16 data or if someone is using the census data. have -- they would -- it's a library. They help 17 17 Q Have you had any discussions with anyone about with bill drafting. They also provide information 18 whether the final districts will not strictly 18 on current statutes, and they're able to inform 19 19 match those prescribed by Acts 43 and 44? legislators of the public or whoever asks. 20 A I think that's pretty much a given. I mean, if 20 Q Who did LRB and LTSB make a request to that this 21 21 you think about what GAB is doing, they're Redistricting Staff Working Group be convened? 22 A To the JCLO. 22 gathering datasets that don't follow the census 23 23 Q What's the JCLO? blocks, so in essence, the lines will not strictly 24 match. I don't know how far off they would be. I 24 A Joint Organization of -- on Legislative 25 25 haven't seen the GAB's data, per se, their final Organization. Is that -- JCLO. 89 91 1 1 MR. McLEOD: Joint Committee on datasets, so. 2 2 Q All right. You can set that document to the side. Legislative Operations. 3 Mr. Van Der Wielen, another document that I know 3 A Operations? 4 you produced on the materials that you gave to us Q Joint Committee on Legislative Operations? today --A T believe so. Q Terrific. When was that request made? 6 A Uh-huh. 7 (Exhibit No. 153 marked for A Oh, 2009, sometime. identification) Q Was the committee convened at that time, or the 9 Q -- appears to be minutes of a meeting from working group convened at that time? 10 10 January 14th, 2011. A All the meeting notes and agendas are online, so I 11 A Okay. 11 would assume it was sometime in 2009 it started. 12 Q Can you identify what Exhibit 153, please? I don't know the exact date. Somewhere around 13 13 A Meeting minutes from the January 14th RSWG. there. 14 14 **Q** What is the Redistricting Staff Working Group or Q How many times had the working group met before 15 15 RSWG? 16 A It's a working group that was led by Steve Miller 16 A Several times. I don't know the exact number. It 17 17 and Jeff Ylvisaker, just to get technical issues would have been seven, eight times. It was 18 18 out there for the redistricting process. It's a similar to what we did ten years ago. The same 19 very long and complicating process that requires a 19 group was formed. 20 20 Q Similar what, to what was done for redistricting lot of planning and a lot of cooperation. So this 21 21 was, this group was JCLO, and we had asked to purposes after the 2000 census? 22 create this group, and JCLO I believe had a ballot 22 A Yep. Prior to the census, we would have wanted 23 that said we could create this or that it should 23 this organization to get together. be created. 24 Q This appears to be a bipartisan or group that

25

is -- includes the nonpartisan bureaus and

25

Q All right. Now, we're going to be in federal

VIDEOTAPE DEPOSITION OF TONY J. VAN DER WIELEN 2/7/2012 counsels and also --A I see that. 2 A Uh-huh. 2 Q And if you turn the page, you'll see that there is $\boldsymbol{\mathsf{Q}}\,$ -- members of both political parties in the 3 a reference there to a topic of census data and legislature; is that correct? other information used by others in developing the 5 A Yep, absolutely. new redistricting maps, then in parens, 2011 **Q** How many times did the working group meet in 2011? Wisconsin Acts 43 and 44, closed paren. Do you A I don't know. At least once. see that? Q Met on January 14th? 8 A Uh-huh. A Yeah. Q Has anybody talked with you about testifying at 10 10 Q Did you meet at all after that time? the trial of this case? 11 11 A I don't know. It's been a long road, 2011. 12 Q Yeah. Well, back in the 2001 time frame, there Q You've not been asked to testify at the trial in 13 was a working group back at that time too; is that 13 this case? 14 14 A No. I -- the only time I ever talked to anybody, correct? 15 15 A Yep. they had just said I may be deposed, but that was 16 Q Were you on that working group? 16 17 17 Q You can set that to the side. 18 Q How many times did the working group meet during 18 I'm going to hand you another document that 19 19 the redistricting process in 2001? we've marked as an exhibit at a previous 20 A Probably a little bit more last time. I mean, and 20 deposition. This is Exhibit No. 79. 21 21 that was the first time, I believe, the group had A Okav. 22 22 Q Have you seen Exhibit No. 79 before, Mr. Van Der been convened at all. 23 Q Did the working group continue to convene back in 23 24 2001 until the time that the final districts were 24 A Yep. 25 25 Q When did you see -proposed? 93 95 A I don't know if they did that far. Once local 1 1 A Briefly. 2 redistricting started, there wasn't a whole lot of Q When did you see Exhibit No. 79 before? 3 3 meeting. Everybody at that point was just too A I believe it was right before the meeting that we 4 busy. But there are meeting notes and minutes for had with GAB for the first time. It was the group from 2000 also. They're not included in mid-November. 6 6 Q Is your understanding that the topics covered in anything, but. 7 Q We didn't ask for them, so I understand. All 7 the January 13th memorandum cover the topics in 8 right. Great, thanks. You can set that to the the November 10th memorandum as well, generally q side. q speaking? 10 10 A Okay. A I would be generally speaking, so. But, sure. 11 (Exhibit No. 154 marked for 11 Q Did you see -- when you saw the January 13th memo 12 12 identification) for the first time, did it strike you that there 13 13 Q Mr. Van Der Wielen, I'm handing you a document was something that had been raised in your 14 14 that's been marked as Exhibit No. 154. mid-November meeting or in that November 10th memo 15 15 A Okay. that wasn't still at issue on January 13th? 16 16 Q Have you seen Exhibit No. 154 before? A I don't know. I really don't, you know, I 17 17 A I don't believe so. haven't -- to be quite honest, with the 18 18 Q I'd like you to turn to the second page of information that they put in these memorandums, 19 Exhibit 154, and you'll see that the document, 19 they -- some of it I agree with and some of it I 20 20 don't agree with. So I would have read these there's a title there in the middle of the page. 21 21 it says Defendants' Supplement to the Amended documents, but I have not studied them. So I 22 22 Initial Rule 26(a) Disclosures; do you see that? don't know if they're resolving anything in the 23 23

24 of 43 sheets 2:11-cw/00f0:7-dref PENEROUR DINADIS/ON16 ORage 2/6081839-0392ent 173 to 96 of 115

24

25

then --

Q And your name is identified there; do you see

25

that?

January 13th memo compared to the November 10th

memo or -- so I guess, if it's a specific thing,

```
Q Well, I was just wondering whether -- the
                                                                    don't have the data, they don't -- they can't have
 2
                                                             2
       January 13th memo, as it's been represented to me,
                                                                   more accurate data.
 3
       was a little bit more complete thinking coming out
                                                             {f 3} {f Q} Is there anything else, any other statements that
       of the problems or the issues that were identified
                                                             4
                                                                    are made in that January 13th memo that you
 5
                                                             5
       in the November 10th memo, and I --
                                                                    disagree with?
 6
    A I couldn't speak to that. I don't know. As far
                                                             6
                                                                 A Well, just in general, the census data -- or the
 7
                                                             7
       as -- I mean, a lot of it, talking about accuracy
                                                                    collection blocks that are used by the U.S. Census
 8
       of TIGER and -- which some things they say are
                                                             8
                                                                    Bureau are statistical areas. They're not meant
       correct and some are not.
                                                                    to be depicted as actual municipal boundaries. I
10
                                                            10
    Q What do they say that you've identified that's not
                                                                   mean, they disclaim that over and over in the
11
                                                            11
       correct, or that you don't believe is correct?
                                                                    census data. So it's, when you're putting
12
    A It's not accurate. So it's --
                                                            12
                                                                    together -- everything is tabulated at the census
                                                            13
    Q I have to ask you which document you're in?
                                                                   block and then aggregated up. Census blocks would
14
                                                            14
    A So this would be the January 13th document. I
                                                                   be aggregated up to a municipal line. So the
15
       believe they reference this several times in other
                                                            15
                                                                    municipal boundaries don't drive the statistics,
16
       documents as well. The TIGER line shapefile
                                                            16
                                                                    the blocks do. So some of the premises that they
17
                                                            17
       technical documentation, they're referencing that,
                                                                    explain in some of these documents aren't
18
                                                            18
       it says positional accuracy is plus or minus
                                                                   necessarily, in my opinion, the correct way of
19
                                                            19
       50 feet or 167 feet. I believe that was from the
                                                                    looking at them.
20
       2000 technical documentation. The accuracy has
                                                            20
                                                                 Q All right. There were a few other documents that
21
                                                            21
       been increased quite a bit through census. They
                                                                   you brought with you today, I wanted to mark these
22
                                                            22
       actually don't get some of the credit they
                                                                    as exhibits.
23
                                                            23
                                                                            (Exhibit Nos. 155 and 156 marked for
       deserve. It's gone from plus or minus 50 meters
24
                                                            24
       to plus or minus 7.8 meters.
                                                                             identification)
25
                                                            25 Q Mr. Van Der Wielen, I'm handing you copies of
    Q You're reading there, that's page 3 of the
                          97
                                                                                       99
1
       January 13th memo; is that correct?
                                                             1
                                                                    documents we've marked as Exhibits 155 and 156.
 2
                                                             2 A Yep.
   A Page 3.
 3
    Q And so the middle of the page, there is a caption
                                                             3 Q I'm going to give these to your counsel here, and
 4
       that says Accuracy of TIGER and WISE-LR Maps,
                                                                    then I'll ask you a few questions about them.
       correct?
                                                                        Let's see, which one is 155?
 6
                                                             6
   A Uh-huh.
                                                                A 155 is Ronald Keith Graddie -- or Gaddie.
 7
    Q And so it's that second full paragraph that you're
                                                             7
                                                                 Q Mr. Van Der Wielen, I've handed you copies of
       reading from?
                                                             8
                                                                    documents.
 9
    A Right.
                                                             9
                                                                                MR. POLAND: Why don't we go off
                                                            10
10
    Q So you're saying that the 2010 census TIGER line
                                                                        the record for just a second.
11
       shapefiles are actual -- TIGER 2010 data are
                                                            11
                                                                                    (Recess)
12
                                                            12
       actually more accurate than they're giving you
                                                                                 MR. POLAND: We can go back on the
13
       credit for here?
                                                            13
                                                                        record.
14
                                                            14
                                                                Q Mr. Van Der Wielen, I've handed you two documents.
   A Right. When they measure accuracy of datasets,
                                                            15
15
       they measure the most accurate part of the
                                                                    One has been marked as Exhibit No. 155, and one is
16
       dataset. So plus or minus 50 meters, there may be
                                                            16
                                                                    Exhibit No. 156. Do you have those in front of
17
                                                            17
       some locations in the current dataset that are
                                                                   vou?
18
                                                            18
       plus or minus 167 feet, but the Census Bureau did
                                                                A Yes.
19
       try to be a lot more accurate this time around,
                                                            19
                                                                Q Would you identify -- let's start with
20
                                                            20
       and it was around 7 or 8 meter accuracy compared
                                                                    Exhibit 155. Would you please identify that for
21
                                                            21
       to ten years ago where it was plus or minus
                                                                    the record, please?
22
                                                            22 A It's a document that was created to explain the
       50 meters or plus or minus 167 feet.
                                                            23
23
           That accuracy does depend on the datasets
                                                                    disclosures -- or explain some data that was given
24
       that are given to them, and those datasets would
                                                            24
                                                                    to Ronald Keith Gaddie.
25
                                                            {f 25} {f Q} This is a letter that you sent, correct?
       be given to them by local officials. So if they
```

some of the document production that we did. 2 Q It doesn't have your signature on it, but it has 2 A Yeah. 3 your name on it, correct? Q Exhibit 155 and 156 consist of letters that were written that describe documents that were sent to 5 Q Dated December 6, 2011? certain individuals; is that correct? A Yep. 6 A Yes. 7 7 Q Do you know who Ronald Keith Gaddie is? Q And those documents were sent from the LTSB's files; is that correct? Q Who asked you to send Exhibit 155? A Yes. 10 10 A I was asked by Marie Lazar. Q And the procedure was that certain documents were 11 11 Q Ms. Lazar? requested by our office and other parties in this 12 A Yeah. 12 case; is that correct? 13 Q And then Exhibit No. 156? A Yes. 14 A Same documents, sent to John Diez. 14 Q Now, the three items, the three files that you put Q So same letter, same date, just going to Mr. Diez, 15 on the flash drives are listed there on 16 16 correct? Exhibits 155 and 156, correct? 17 17 A Yep. A Yep. 18 Q Do you know who Mr. Diez is? 18 Q And next, the 2010 census data, correct? 19 19 Q Ms. Lazar asked you to send that as well? 20 Q Now, if you look at 156, do some of the things 21 21 A Yes. that you have on the flash drive today that you 22 Q And the documents or the materials that would have 22 produced also match the things you gave on the 23 accompanied these letters are identified in the 23 flash drives with 155 and 156? 24 24 A Yes. letter itself? 25 A Yep. 25 Q And where would they be, what file? 101 103 1 Q Were there any other people that you were asked to 1 A The Statewide 10 folders. They would be under 2 2 provide this particular data to by Ms. Lazar? folder 1. 3 A No. Oh, there was an extra copy that was created, 3 Q Okay. So all of the items in 155 and 156 are in but it wasn't directed towards anybody, I believe. item 1? Q All right. And I think I'm going to allow A Not all of them. 6 6 Q Okay. Are they elsewhere on the --Ms. Lazar to take you through that examination in 7 a few minutes because she knows more about it than A No. I do. Q Okav. 9 A Okay. 9 A so the only thing that would match would be the 10 10 Statewide 10 folders. MR. POLAND: Why don't we go off 11 the record, and give me a couple minutes 11 Q Okay. 12 12 here, and I might be done. A We would not have, as part of this, as part of 13 13 (Recess) Exhibit 147, we would not have included a block 14 14 MS. LAZAR: Mr. Van Der Wielen, I'm assignment file for Wisconsin Act 43, amended, 15 Maria Lazar with the attorney general's 15 senate and assembly, and we did not include a ward 16 office. I'm just going to ask you a few 16 file from WISE-LR. 17 17 Q So what you did include was number 2 on 155 and follow-up questions. 18 18 156? 19 19 A Yes. EXAMINATION 20 20 Q All right. And that information was placed inside By Ms. Lazar: 21 21 Q We're going to start out with just, if you can envelopes that you sealed and signed? 22 22 A Yes. look at your Exhibit -- now I don't have it in 23 front of me. Yes, I do. It's Exhibit 146. And 23 Q And two of the three flash drives were provided to if you can also pull up Exhibit 155. So we're the individuals in these letters, Diez and Gaddie? 25 25 A Right. looking at 146 and 155. I just want to clarify

Q And the third was just in an envelope that was A TIGER is the geographic database for the 2 2 signed? Census Bureau. It's Topologically Integrated 3 A Yes. 3 Geographic Referencing Encoding System. It's an 4 Q Thank you. Okay. 5 All right. Previously you testified Q Is some of the --6 regarding -- let's look at Exhibit 151, which A Something along those lines. 7 7 Q Is some of the concern coming because, as you put is -- those are your questions that you had for the Government Accountability Board at a meeting it, and I don't know what two things you said, you that occurred I believe in December? said census data and you described local data, and 10 10 A Yes. you said they all exist in their separate worlds? 11 11 $\boldsymbol{\mathsf{Q}}\,$ Did LTSB do any analysis as to whether or not the 12 12 GAB was assigning voters to other legislative Q And is some of the problem that we're overlaying 13 13 districts? the two of those together when they shouldn't be? 14 A No. 14 A Yes. Q Do you know if that's exactly what GAB was doing? 15 Q And that's causing this issue? 16 16 A I have no idea. I -- they told us the areas that 17 17 may be affected by what they were doing, but they Q And for example, there was a mention of geocodes 18 18 didn't tell us exactly what they were doing with putting people off the coast of Africa. Do you 19 19 know why that's caused? those people. 20 Q So what you do know, what you can take away from 20 A Absolutely. 21 21 Q And why is that caused? that meeting was what GAB told you that they were 22 22 doing, but you don't know if they actually were A It's error. 23 23 Q By whom? doing that? 24 A Right. 24 A The person doing the geocoding. 25 Q Now, in the next memo that you wrote -- or not you Q So the local clerk typing in a wrong number? 105 107 1 wrote, the next memo that the head of LRB and LTSB 1 A That could be one of the forms of error. It could 2 sent to legislative leaders --2 be an address that isn't found in the underlying 3 3 A Right. dataset, they're using the geocode. It could be Q -- that was based upon discussions that you had at just the user doing something wrong as far as the this meeting; is that correct? geocoding is concerned. It could be the actual 6 6 A Yes. geocoder encountering an error. Geocoding is done 7 Q And were Steve Miller or Jeff Ylvisaker at that 7 basically using algorithms, and if the algorithm meeting? doesn't like what you put in, the result you get 9 A Yes. q is not very good, so. 00 is off the coast of 10 10 Q So they were at the December meeting? Africa. 11 A Yep. 11 Q So that could be a typing error by a clerk? 12 12 Q And this letter was sent, and I hope I'm not A Could have been a typing error. It could have 13 13 misquoting you, you said was because GAB did not been a problem with the geocoding system that 14 14 they're using. It could be a various -- there are send something to the legislative leaders, so you 15 wanted to do this? 15 various factors in geocoding that you need to look 16 A We -- yeah. After we knew what was going on and 16 for when you're doing it. And an error could 17 17 result in a 00 geocode, which would put someone understood the scope of it, if they weren't going 18 18 to notify them, we felt we should. off the coast of Africa. 19 Q And that was more of a concern over what GAB had 19 Q And when you start out, you use the, you being 20 20 said they were doing? LTSB, you use the census data, correct? 21 A Yes. 21 A Use census data. 22 22 Q You also mentioned that, you talk about TIGER Q And there's a presumption that that census data is 23 23 lines in some of these memos, and you describe accurate, correct? what TIGER lines are. Are TIGER lines the actual 24 A Yes.

25

Q You also mentioned that you were involved in 108

25

census lines, or what are TIGER lines?

		VIDEOTAPE DEPOSITION OF TO	1 1 1	J.	VIII DEIX VIIEEEIN ZIIIZOIZ
1		redistricting in 2001 and 2002. What did you, not	1		pretty good results. If you're using different
2		LTSB, but you do in 2001, 2002, regarding	2		underlying data, if you're using Bing Maps or
3		redistricting?	3		using some other proprietary software to do the
4	Α	I was in the same role. So we developed we	4		geocoding, you may get results that you don't
5		helped local officials through the WISE-LR	5		expect. You may get people showing up in the
6		application collect municipal ward boundaries,	6		wrong areas. That's
7		develop the applications. We provided hardware,	7	Q	Follow-up question also on that, just on the
8		software and technical support to the legislature,	8		2000 the redistricting this time around versus
9		as far as setting up redistricting systems and	9		after the decennial census in 2000. Is the
10		for the legislative redistricting. I was also a	10		process, from LTSB's standpoint, more complicated
11		technical advisor to the eastern district federal	11		or complex this time than it was in 2000?
12		court as part of the 2002 case.	12	Α	They're both mountains we had to climb. I mean,
13	Q	And what do you mean by that?	13		they're just, it's a huge effort to collect data.
14	Α	They asked me to advise be a technical advisor	14		I don't know if it's anymore complex than it was
15		to the court, so I would supply them with the same	15		ten years ago. There are some the complexity
16		hardware and software that was used for	16		may come in, with the GAB, in regards to the GAB,
17		legislative redistricting here, and then also	17		just helping them get the data into the SVRS
18		answer any questions or be as helpful as I could	18		system or helping them or supplying them with
19		to the judges and their staff.	19		date that needs to go into SVRS. I mean, that is
20		MS. LAZAR: I have no further	20		complicated thing that we didn't deal with ten
21		questions.	21		years ago because it was pretty much handled by
22		MR. POLAND: Just a couple of	22		the local officials.
23		questions.	23	Q	So what was the difference what was handled by
24			24		local officials versus what's being done in 2011?
			25		
25			25	А	Corrections. I mean, if the data didn't align,
25		109	25	А	Corrections. I mean, if the data didn't align, 111
25		109 RE-EXAMINATION	1	— —	
	Ву				111
1	_	RE-EXAMINATION	1	A 	111 they had to administer an election and they had to
1 2	_	RE-EXAMINATION Mr. Poland:	1 2	<u> </u>	they had to administer an election and they had to make sure people voted in the right spot. So if
1 2 3	_	RE-EXAMINATION Mr. Poland: I can't remember where I saw it, but I thought I	1 2 3		they had to administer an election and they had to make sure people voted in the right spot. So if there was, you know, if a census line intersected
1 2 3 4	_	RE-EXAMINATION Mr. Poland: I can't remember where I saw it, but I thought I saw a reference in a memo someplace that there	1 2 3 4	A	they had to administer an election and they had to make sure people voted in the right spot. So if there was, you know, if a census line intersected a parcel, they would have to make some type of
1 2 3 4 5	_	RE-EXAMINATION Mr. Poland: I can't remember where I saw it, but I thought I saw a reference in a memo someplace that there were that the putting the problem with	1 2 3 4 5	A	they had to administer an election and they had to make sure people voted in the right spot. So if there was, you know, if a census line intersected a parcel, they would have to make some type of determination where that person voted, either in,
1 2 3 4 5 6	_	RE-EXAMINATION Mr. Poland: I can't remember where I saw it, but I thought I saw a reference in a memo someplace that there were that the putting the problem with putting people off the coast of Africa was a	1 2 3 4 5 6	A	they had to administer an election and they had to make sure people voted in the right spot. So if there was, you know, if a census line intersected a parcel, they would have to make some type of determination where that person voted, either in, you know, district 1 or district 2. Because most
1 2 3 4 5 6 7	_	RE-EXAMINATION Mr. Poland: I can't remember where I saw it, but I thought I saw a reference in a memo someplace that there were that the putting the problem with putting people off the coast of Africa was a result of having voters assigned to a as close	1 2 3 4 5 6 7		they had to administer an election and they had to make sure people voted in the right spot. So if there was, you know, if a census line intersected a parcel, they would have to make some type of determination where that person voted, either in, you know, district 1 or district 2. Because most local officials, their datasets that they're
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	Q	RE-EXAMINATION Mr. Poland: I can't remember where I saw it, but I thought I saw a reference in a memo someplace that there were that the putting the problem with putting people off the coast of Africa was a result of having voters assigned to a as close as possible to the Prime Meridian? Uh-huh. Equator.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8	Α	they had to administer an election and they had to make sure people voted in the right spot. So if there was, you know, if a census line intersected a parcel, they would have to make some type of determination where that person voted, either in, you know, district 1 or district 2. Because most local officials, their datasets that they're really concerned about are parcels, your
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	Q	RE-EXAMINATION Mr. Poland: I can't remember where I saw it, but I thought I saw a reference in a memo someplace that there were that the putting the problem with putting people off the coast of Africa was a result of having voters assigned to a as close as possible to the Prime Meridian? Uh-huh. Equator.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	A	they had to administer an election and they had to make sure people voted in the right spot. So if there was, you know, if a census line intersected a parcel, they would have to make some type of determination where that person voted, either in, you know, district 1 or district 2. Because most local officials, their datasets that they're really concerned about are parcels, your individual piece of land and where you're assigned
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	Q	Mr. Poland: I can't remember where I saw it, but I thought I saw a reference in a memo someplace that there were that the putting the problem with putting people off the coast of Africa was a result of having voters assigned to a as close as possible to the Prime Meridian? Uh-huh. Equator. That they couldn't identify an address for them.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	A	they had to administer an election and they had to make sure people voted in the right spot. So if there was, you know, if a census line intersected a parcel, they would have to make some type of determination where that person voted, either in, you know, district 1 or district 2. Because most local officials, their datasets that they're really concerned about are parcels, your individual piece of land and where you're assigned to a school district or to a congressional
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	Q	Mr. Poland: I can't remember where I saw it, but I thought I saw a reference in a memo someplace that there were that the putting the problem with putting people off the coast of Africa was a result of having voters assigned to a as close as possible to the Prime Meridian? Uh-huh. Equator. That they couldn't identify an address for them. Am I not recalling that correctly, or do you recall anything about that? 00 is, yeah, so it would be the Prime Meridian and	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	A	they had to administer an election and they had to make sure people voted in the right spot. So if there was, you know, if a census line intersected a parcel, they would have to make some type of determination where that person voted, either in, you know, district 1 or district 2. Because most local officials, their datasets that they're really concerned about are parcels, your individual piece of land and where you're assigned to a school district or to a congressional district or an assembly district or to an alderman
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	Q A Q	Mr. Poland: I can't remember where I saw it, but I thought I saw a reference in a memo someplace that there were that the putting the problem with putting people off the coast of Africa was a result of having voters assigned to a as close as possible to the Prime Meridian? Uh-huh. Equator. That they couldn't identify an address for them. Am I not recalling that correctly, or do you recall anything about that? 00 is, yeah, so it would be the Prime Meridian and the equator. I don't know. I've never seen that	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14		they had to administer an election and they had to make sure people voted in the right spot. So if there was, you know, if a census line intersected a parcel, they would have to make some type of determination where that person voted, either in, you know, district 1 or district 2. Because most local officials, their datasets that they're really concerned about are parcels, your individual piece of land and where you're assigned to a school district or to a congressional district or an assembly district or to an alderman district or any other district. So, and when they group those together, they do that at the local level.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	Q A Q	RE-EXAMINATION Mr. Poland: I can't remember where I saw it, but I thought I saw a reference in a memo someplace that there were that the putting the problem with putting people off the coast of Africa was a result of having voters assigned to a as close as possible to the Prime Meridian? Uh-huh. Equator. That they couldn't identify an address for them. Am I not recalling that correctly, or do you recall anything about that? 00 is, yeah, so it would be the Prime Meridian and the equator. I don't know. I've never seen that in any reference document. But it's pretty	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15		they had to administer an election and they had to make sure people voted in the right spot. So if there was, you know, if a census line intersected a parcel, they would have to make some type of determination where that person voted, either in, you know, district 1 or district 2. Because most local officials, their datasets that they're really concerned about are parcels, your individual piece of land and where you're assigned to a school district or to a congressional district or an assembly district or to an alderman district or any other district. So, and when they group those together, they do that at the local level. So in 2001, if that redistricting corrections or
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	Q A Q	Mr. Poland: I can't remember where I saw it, but I thought I saw a reference in a memo someplace that there were that the putting the problem with putting people off the coast of Africa was a result of having voters assigned to a as close as possible to the Prime Meridian? Uh-huh. Equator. That they couldn't identify an address for them. Am I not recalling that correctly, or do you recall anything about that? 00 is, yeah, so it would be the Prime Meridian and the equator. I don't know. I've never seen that in any reference document. But it's pretty standard, I mean, if you the process of	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16		they had to administer an election and they had to make sure people voted in the right spot. So if there was, you know, if a census line intersected a parcel, they would have to make some type of determination where that person voted, either in, you know, district 1 or district 2. Because most local officials, their datasets that they're really concerned about are parcels, your individual piece of land and where you're assigned to a school district or to a congressional district or an assembly district or to an alderman district or any other district. So, and when they group those together, they do that at the local level. So in 2001, if that redistricting corrections or discrepancies were made at the or accounted for
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	Q A Q	Mr. Poland: I can't remember where I saw it, but I thought I saw a reference in a memo someplace that there were that the putting the problem with putting people off the coast of Africa was a result of having voters assigned to a as close as possible to the Prime Meridian? Uh-huh. Equator. That they couldn't identify an address for them. Am I not recalling that correctly, or do you recall anything about that? 00 is, yeah, so it would be the Prime Meridian and the equator. I don't know. I've never seen that in any reference document. But it's pretty standard, I mean, if you the process of geocoding that we would normally follow, if you're	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	Q	they had to administer an election and they had to make sure people voted in the right spot. So if there was, you know, if a census line intersected a parcel, they would have to make some type of determination where that person voted, either in, you know, district 1 or district 2. Because most local officials, their datasets that they're really concerned about are parcels, your individual piece of land and where you're assigned to a school district or to a congressional district or an assembly district or to an alderman district or any other district. So, and when they group those together, they do that at the local level. So in 2001, if that redistricting corrections or discrepancies were made at the or accounted for at the local level; is that correct?
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	Q A Q	RE-EXAMINATION Mr. Poland: I can't remember where I saw it, but I thought I saw a reference in a memo someplace that there were that the putting the problem with putting people off the coast of Africa was a result of having voters assigned to a as close as possible to the Prime Meridian? Uh-huh. Equator. That they couldn't identify an address for them. Am I not recalling that correctly, or do you recall anything about that? 00 is, yeah, so it would be the Prime Meridian and the equator. I don't know. I've never seen that in any reference document. But it's pretty standard, I mean, if you the process of geocoding that we would normally follow, if you're geocoding, you need to geocode with the correct	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	Q	they had to administer an election and they had to make sure people voted in the right spot. So if there was, you know, if a census line intersected a parcel, they would have to make some type of determination where that person voted, either in, you know, district 1 or district 2. Because most local officials, their datasets that they're really concerned about are parcels, your individual piece of land and where you're assigned to a school district or to a congressional district or an assembly district or to an alderman district or any other district. So, and when they group those together, they do that at the local level. So in 2001, if that redistricting corrections or discrepancies were made at the or accounted for at the local level; is that correct?
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	Q A Q	RE-EXAMINATION Mr. Poland: I can't remember where I saw it, but I thought I saw a reference in a memo someplace that there were that the putting the problem with putting people off the coast of Africa was a result of having voters assigned to a as close as possible to the Prime Meridian? Uh-huh. Equator. That they couldn't identify an address for them. Am I not recalling that correctly, or do you recall anything about that? 00 is, yeah, so it would be the Prime Meridian and the equator. I don't know. I've never seen that in any reference document. But it's pretty standard, I mean, if you the process of geocoding that we would normally follow, if you're geocoding, you need to geocode with the correct data, and the correct data in this case would	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	Q	they had to administer an election and they had to make sure people voted in the right spot. So if there was, you know, if a census line intersected a parcel, they would have to make some type of determination where that person voted, either in, you know, district 1 or district 2. Because most local officials, their datasets that they're really concerned about are parcels, your individual piece of land and where you're assigned to a school district or to a congressional district or an assembly district or to an alderman district or any other district. So, and when they group those together, they do that at the local level. So in 2001, if that redistricting corrections or discrepancies were made at the or accounted for at the local level; is that correct? Right. And that's not what's happening with this
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	Q A Q	Mr. Poland: I can't remember where I saw it, but I thought I saw a reference in a memo someplace that there were that the putting the problem with putting people off the coast of Africa was a result of having voters assigned to a as close as possible to the Prime Meridian? Uh-huh. Equator. That they couldn't identify an address for them. Am I not recalling that correctly, or do you recall anything about that? 00 is, yeah, so it would be the Prime Meridian and the equator. I don't know. I've never seen that in any reference document. But it's pretty standard, I mean, if you the process of geocoding that we would normally follow, if you're geocoding, you need to geocode with the correct data, and the correct data in this case would probably be the TIGER data. They have a set of	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	Q A Q	they had to administer an election and they had to make sure people voted in the right spot. So if there was, you know, if a census line intersected a parcel, they would have to make some type of determination where that person voted, either in, you know, district 1 or district 2. Because most local officials, their datasets that they're really concerned about are parcels, your individual piece of land and where you're assigned to a school district or to a congressional district or an assembly district or to an alderman district or any other district. So, and when they group those together, they do that at the local level. So in 2001, if that redistricting corrections or discrepancies were made at the or accounted for at the local level; is that correct? Right. And that's not what's happening with this redistricting?
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	Q A Q	Mr. Poland: I can't remember where I saw it, but I thought I saw a reference in a memo someplace that there were that the putting the problem with putting people off the coast of Africa was a result of having voters assigned to a as close as possible to the Prime Meridian? Uh-huh. Equator. That they couldn't identify an address for them. Am I not recalling that correctly, or do you recall anything about that? 00 is, yeah, so it would be the Prime Meridian and the equator. I don't know. I've never seen that in any reference document. But it's pretty standard, I mean, if you the process of geocoding that we would normally follow, if you're geocoding, you need to geocode with the correct data, and the correct data in this case would probably be the TIGER data. They have a set of data that you can use for geocoding with TIGER.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	Q A Q	they had to administer an election and they had to make sure people voted in the right spot. So if there was, you know, if a census line intersected a parcel, they would have to make some type of determination where that person voted, either in, you know, district 1 or district 2. Because most local officials, their datasets that they're really concerned about are parcels, your individual piece of land and where you're assigned to a school district or to a congressional district or an assembly district or to an alderman district or any other district. So, and when they group those together, they do that at the local level. So in 2001, if that redistricting corrections or discrepancies were made at the or accounted for at the local level; is that correct? Right. And that's not what's happening with this redistricting? It's a little bit different this time around. The
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	Q A Q	Mr. Poland: I can't remember where I saw it, but I thought I saw a reference in a memo someplace that there were that the putting the problem with putting people off the coast of Africa was a result of having voters assigned to a as close as possible to the Prime Meridian? Uh-huh. Equator. That they couldn't identify an address for them. Am I not recalling that correctly, or do you recall anything about that? 00 is, yeah, so it would be the Prime Meridian and the equator. I don't know. I've never seen that in any reference document. But it's pretty standard, I mean, if you the process of geocoding that we would normally follow, if you're geocoding, you need to geocode with the correct data, and the correct data in this case would probably be the TIGER data. They have a set of	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	Q A Q	they had to administer an election and they had to make sure people voted in the right spot. So if there was, you know, if a census line intersected a parcel, they would have to make some type of determination where that person voted, either in, you know, district 1 or district 2. Because most local officials, their datasets that they're really concerned about are parcels, your individual piece of land and where you're assigned to a school district or to a congressional district or an assembly district or to an alderman district or any other district. So, and when they group those together, they do that at the local level. So in 2001, if that redistricting corrections or discrepancies were made at the or accounted for at the local level; is that correct? Right. And that's not what's happening with this redistricting?

24

25

GAB. They implement their -- it into their SVRS

system, they've encountered some technical

24

25

their blocks, so that if you're using the TIGER

geocoder with the TIGER data, you're going to get

```
employed by the parties hereto or financially
       difficulties. We try to help them through that as
                                                                    interested in the action.
 2
                                                                                In witness whereof I have hereunto set my
       much as we can. But that process does complicate
                                                                    hand and affixed my notarial seal this 13th day of
 3
       things quite a bit. I mean, it's, especially when
                                                                    February 2012.
                                                                 6
 4
       stuff like this occurs, they are fairly new to
                                                                                         Notary Public, State of Wisconsin
 5
       GIS, so it's -- some of the errors and technical
                                                                8
                                                                                         Registered Professional Reporter
 6
       problems that you see would have probably been
                                                                9
 7
       handled at the local level and just not, you know,
                                                                    My commission expires
 8
                                                                10
                                                                    July 15, 2012
       brought to light in these means. So it would have
 9
        just been handled at the local level and everybody
                                                                11
10
       move forward. So it's.
                                                                12
11
                     MR. POLAND: Thank you. I don't
                                                                13
12
            have any further questions.
                                                                14
13
                     MS. LAZAR: No further.
14
                                                                15
              (Adjourning at 12 o'clock p.m.)
15
                                                                16
16
                                                                17
17
                                                                18
18
                                                                19
19
20
                                                                20
21
                                                                21
22
                                                                22
23
                                                                23
24
                                                                24
25
                                                                25
                            113
                                                                                           115
    STATE OF WISCONSIN )
```

```
) ss.
   COUNTY OF DANE
 3
             I, SARAH FINLEY PELLETTER, a Registered
    Professional Reporter and Notary Public duly
    commissioned and qualified in and for the State of
    Wisconsin, do hereby certify that pursuant to
 7
    subpoena, there came before me on the 7th day of
    February 2012, at 9:17 in the forenoon, at the
 9
    offices of Godfrey & Kahn, S.C., Attorneys at Law,
10
    One East Main Street, in the City of Madison, County
11
    of Dane, and State of Wisconsin, the following named
12
    person, to wit: TONY J. VAN DER WIELEN, who was by
13
    me duly sworn to testify to the truth and nothing but
14
    the truth of his knowledge touching and concerning
15
    the matters in controversy in this cause; that he was
16
    thereupon carefully examined upon his oath and his
17
    examination reduced to typewriting with
18
    computer-aided transcription; that the deposition is
19
    a true record of the testimony given by the witness;
20
    and that reading and signing was not waived.
21
              I further certify that I am neither
22
    attorney or counsel for, nor related to or employed
23
    by any of the parties to the action in which this
    deposition is taken and further that I am not a
    relative or employee of any attorney or counsel
```

0	14:15, 14:23, 14:25, 20:6, 104:13	200 [1] - 19:14 2000 [10] - 32:15,	417 [1] - 6:16 43 [31] - 29:18,	79 [4] - 3:23, 95:20, 95:22, 96:2
00 [3] - 108:9,	148 [12] - 3:16,	32:17, 32:22, 36:4,	29:23, 30:12, 31:20,	7th [2] - 5:13, 114:7
108:17, 110:13	24:18, 25:3, 25:5, 25:11, 25:20, 42:23,	92:21, 94:5, 97:20, 111:8, 111:9, 111:11	31:23, 32:24, 33:14, 34:10, 50:19, 50:21,	0
100.11, 110.10	56:18, 57:1, 64:18,	2001 [14] - 32:15,	51:6, 52:7, 53:2,	8
1	64:24, 65:2	34:10, 34:18, 35:7,	53:19, 54:24, 55:2,	
•	149 [8] - 3:18, 59:5,	36:2, 36:11, 36:14,	61:2, 66:13, 66:19,	8 [4] - 56:15, 57:18,
	59:9, 59:18, 61:24,	37:12, 93:12, 93:19,	71:19, 72:1, 74:13,	67:18, 98:20
1 [13] - 11:3, 13:22,	64:3, 64:23	93:24, 109:1, 109:2,	74:19, 86:14, 86:23,	80 [4] - 80:1, 85:2,
14:7, 17:18, 17:19,	14th [5] - 53:17,	112:15	88:19, 89:19, 95:6,	85:15, 88:8
18:1, 19:23, 20:9,	90:10, 90:13, 92:15,	2002 [4] - 36:5,	104:14	_
81:3, 85:18, 104:2,	93:8	109:1, 109:2, 109:12	44 [27] - 29:18,	9
104:4, 112:6 1(a [1] - 15:15	15 [5] - 24:2, 24:11,	2004 [1] - 58:3	29:23, 30:12, 31:20,	
1,071 [2] - 50:20,	50:21, 65:17, 115:10	2009 [2] - 92:7, 92:11	31:24, 32:24, 33:14,	9 [5] - 3:11, 25:8,
82:8	150 [9] - 3:19, 70:3,	2010 [6] - 15:11,	34:10, 51:2, 51:5,	32:24, 57:2, 67:23
1,266 [1] - 85:25	70:5, 70:8, 70:19,	15:13, 87:23, 98:10,	51:6, 52:7, 53:2,	90 [1] - 4:4
1/13/12 [1] - 3:23	71:6, 72:22, 77:24,	98:11, 103:18	54:24, 55:2, 61:2,	94 [1] - 4:5
1/23/12 [1] - 3:23	78:20	2011 [17] - 4:4, 20:2,	66:13, 66:20, 71:19,	94-171 [4] - 15:9,
1/3/12 [1] - 3:19	151 [8] - 3:21, 72:18,	20:19, 32:24, 34:9,	72:1, 74:13, 74:19,	19:5, 19:14, 26:21
10 [8] - 3:14, 15:7,	73:4, 73:15, 73:21,	36:15, 43:6, 54:5,	86:14, 86:23, 88:19,	99.9 [1] - 55:7
28:9, 28:11, 69:20,	73:23, 78:20, 105:6	74:12, 74:13, 74:19,	89:19, 95:6	9:16 [1] - 5:14
104:1, 104:10	152 [3] - 3:23, 79:6,	90:10, 93:6, 93:11,	447-2199 [1] - 6:17	9:17 [1] - 114:8
100 [2] - 4:7, 4:8	79:10	95:5, 101:5, 111:24	5	
1000 [1] - 6:7	153 [3] - 4:3, 90:7, 90:12	2012 [13] - 1:20,	3	Α
102 [1] - 3:5	154 [5] - 4:5, 94:11,	3:14, 5:13, 10:25, 34:2, 34:5, 70:1, 79:2,		
10th [5] - 74:11,	94:14, 94:16, 94:19	80:6, 88:17, 114:8,	5 [3] - 21:19, 85:19,	ability [1] - 41:7
96:8, 96:14, 96:23,	155 [15] - 4:6, 99:23,	115:5, 115:10	86:11	able [9] - 13:4, 27:2,
97:5	100:1, 100:5, 100:6,	2100 [1] - 6:7	50 [6] - 33:11, 58:8,	27:25, 41:16, 53:24,
11 [4] - 20:19, 61:25,	100:15, 100:20,	2266 [1] - 5:23	97:19, 97:23, 98:16,	54:6, 67:10, 84:15,
62:1, 69:20	101:9, 102:24,	23rd [4] - 80:12,	98:22	91:18
11-CV-1011 [1] -	102:25, 103:3,	80:16, 81:11, 82:11	500 [1] - 5:20	absolutely [5] -
2:11	103:16, 103:23,	24 [1] - 3:17	505 [1] - 5:23	47:12, 56:13, 67:17,
11-CV-562 [1] - 1:12	104:3, 104:17	256 [1] - 19:6	512 [1] - 19:6	93:5, 107:20
12 [6] - 11:3, 14:7,	156 [11] - 4:8, 99:23,	26(a [2] - 4:5, 94:22	53021 [1] - 6:16	accompanied [1] -
21:7, 69:21, 70:10,	100:1, 100:16,	262 [1] - 6:17	53202 [2] - 5:23, 6:7	101:23
113:14	101:13, 103:3,		53703 [3] - 5:20, 6:4,	accomplishing [1] -
12(b [2] - 78:25,	103:16, 103:20,	3	6:11	36:13
79:12 - 12/6/11 (2) - 4:6 4:8	103:23, 104:3, 104:18		59 [1] - 3:18	Accountability [6] -
12/6/11 [2] - 4:6, 4:8 13 [2] - 24:2	15th [2] - 34:2, 34:5	3 to 10.0 00.16	5th [1] - 52:24	1:14, 2:2, 2:13, 2:16,
13th [17] - 79:2,	167 [3] - 97:19,	3 [9] - 18:9, 20:16,	6	3:21, 5:5
79:15, 80:6, 80:12,	98:18, 98:22	21:3, 21:8, 25:8, 81:3, 85:18, 97:25, 98:2	6	accountability [9] -
80:17, 81:5, 81:6,	17 [1] - 6:4	3.9 [1] - 39:18		23:7, 23:18, 25:25,
85:3, 96:7, 96:11,	18 [1] - 19:9	39 [6] - 29:6, 29:10,	6 [4] - 21:22, 22:8,	26:6, 43:9, 70:22,
96:15, 96:23, 97:2,	19 [8] - 28:22, 38:5,	34:4, 86:15, 87:22	72:10, 101:5	75:10, 75:18, 105:8
97:14, 98:1, 99:4,	49:25, 50:1, 51:8,	39's [2] - 87:5, 87:11	66 [2] - 51:3, 82:9	accounted [1] -
115:4	51:9, 80:19, 81:20 19th [4] - 29:5,	3rd [9] - 3:14, 10:25,	_	112:16
14 [2] - 3:15, 4:4	29:15, 37:12, 55:7	70:1, 70:16, 71:13,	7	accuracy [11] - 42:9
145 [7] - 3:11, 9:6,	29.15, 37.12, 55.7 1st [2] - 54:5, 87:23	72:24, 77:24, 78:5,		42:14, 58:4, 58:6,
9:7, 9:16, 9:23, 13:18,	131 [2] 137.0, 07.23	83:14	7 [8] - 1:20, 22:13,	97:7, 97:18, 97:20, 98:4, 98:14, 98:20,
13:24	2		25:15, 56:16, 56:21,	98:23
		4	58:11, 88:8, 98:20	accurate [10] - 38:13
146 [16] - 3:12,				
146 [16] - 3:12, 10:12, 10:13, 10:17,			7.8 1 - 97:24	38:16. 38:23. 45:16
10:12, 10:13, 10:17, 10:22, 13:19, 14:1,	2 [9] - 20:11, 20:14,	A ro. 40.0 04.45	7.8 [1] - 97:24 7/110 [1] - 3:4	38:16, 38:23, 45:16, 97:12, 98:12, 98:15.
10:12, 10:13, 10:17, 10:22, 13:19, 14:1, 15:15, 17:19, 18:2,	21:2, 49:25, 57:2,	4 [8] - 19:2, 21:15,	7/110 [1] - 3:4	97:12, 98:12, 98:15,
10:12, 10:13, 10:17, 10:22, 13:19, 14:1, 15:15, 17:19, 18:2, 57:15, 67:15, 78:23,	21:2, 49:25, 57:2, 81:3, 85:18, 104:17,	80:18, 81:3, 81:6,	7/110 [1] - 3:4 70 [1] - 3:20	97:12, 98:12, 98:15, 98:19, 99:2, 108:23
10:12, 10:13, 10:17, 10:22, 13:19, 14:1, 15:15, 17:19, 18:2,	21:2, 49:25, 57:2,		7/110 [1] - 3:4	97:12, 98:12, 98:15,

VIDEO
A at rest 20:6 20:10
Act [33] - 29:6, 29:10,
30:12, 31:20, 31:23,
31:24, 33:14, 34:4,
50:19, 50:21, 51:2,
51:5, 51:6, 52:7, 53:2,
53:19, 55:2, 61:2,
66:13, 66:19, 66:20,
86:15, 87:22, 104:14
act [9] - 29:18, 29:23,
30:19, 52:7, 53:2,
87:5, 87:11
acting [1] - 8:25
Action [1] - 3:11
action [3] - 88:11,
114:23, 115:2
active [8] - 43:5,
43:12, 43:15, 46:8,
49:17, 50:3, 50:15,
61:20
acts [3] - 32:24,
71:19, 74:19
Acts [9] - 34:10,
54:24, 72:1, 74:13,
86:14, 86:23, 88:19,
89:19, 95:6
actual [7] - 19:13,
45:19, 50:10, 98:11,
99:9, 106:24, 108:5
addition [2] - 7:23,
87:4
additional [3] -
28:21, 51:17, 77:5
address [5] - 49:21,
49:23, 87:9, 108:2,
110:10
Adjourning [1] -
113:14
adjust [1] - 45:9
Adjusted [1] - 3:16
adjusted [15] - 22:14,
25:13, 37:19, 37:23,
38:1, 43:8, 44:2, 45:5,
45:17, 47:18, 50:1,
51:18, 55:9, 59:22,
89:11
adjusting [1] - 48:17
adjustment [8] -
•
48:9, 48:12, 48:14,
49:4, 51:21, 51:24,
68:16, 89:13
adjustments [2] -
45:23, 45:25
administer [1] -
112:1
administration [1] -
12:5
administrative [1] -
12:6
administrators [1] -
70.47
76:17

```
advise [1] - 109:14
 advisor [2] - 109:11,
109:14
 affect [1] - 47:3
 affected [13] - 29:10,
39:21, 65:7, 65:11,
68:2, 68:5, 68:6, 68:9,
68:13, 68:21, 82:7,
82:14, 105:17
 affixed [1] - 115:4
 Africa [4] - 107:18,
108:10, 108:18, 110:6
 afterthought [1] -
85:10
 age [1] - 5:2
 agencies [1] - 12:23
 agency [2] - 11:9,
11:21
 agendas [1] - 92:10
 aggregated [2] -
99:13, 99:14
 ago [8] - 27:7, 41:6,
59:11, 73:6, 92:18,
98:21, 111:15, 111:21
 agree [4] - 89:3,
89:5, 96:19, 96:20
 ahead [6] - 10:11,
11:7, 14:9, 24:8, 70:2,
79:4
 aided [1] - 114:18
 al [4] - 5:3, 5:5, 5:21,
5:24
 alderman [2] - 27:4,
112:11
 algorithm [1] - 108:7
 algorithms [1] -
108:7
 align [1] - 111:25
 aligned [1] - 110:23
 allow [2] - 88:1,
102:5
 allowed [2] - 8:7,
87:20
 almost [1] - 55:3
 ALVIN [1] - 1:3
 Alvin [2] - 5:3, 5:21
 ambiguous [1] -
36:18
 amended [2] - 94:21,
104:14
 Amended [1] - 4:5
 amount [1] - 42:12
 AMY [1] - 1:7
 Analysis [1] - 3:16
 analysis [41] - 12:9,
12:22, 22:13, 22:16,
22:23, 22:24, 23:1,
```

23:2, 23:10, 24:4,

25:13, 25:21, 26:4,

37:23, 38:10, 38:24,

```
39:4, 39:6, 43:4, 46:3,
46:4, 46:17, 56:17,
57:4, 57:6, 59:21,
61:23, 64:7, 64:15,
64:17, 65:1, 66:1,
66:2, 70:24, 80:19,
81:20, 82:13, 86:3,
86:4, 105:11
 analyze [2] - 28:14,
38:2
 annexation [3] -
53:25, 54:4, 87:21
 annexations [1] -
55:4
 answer [15] - 8:9,
8:10, 13:5, 14:1, 14:2,
36:18, 61:21, 64:5,
72:7, 72:11, 74:22,
74:24, 75:1, 75:3,
109:18
 answered [1] - 72:5
 answering [1] -
47:12
 answers [2] - 7:22,
8:19
 appear [7] - 61:4,
61:24, 62:8, 62:25,
63:11, 63:16, 63:21
 appearing [5] - 5:20,
5:23, 6:4, 6:8, 6:11
 application [11] -
26:18, 26:19, 26:22,
27:2, 28:18, 28:19,
32:4, 53:15, 54:7,
55:5, 109:6
 applications [1] -
109:7
 appreciate [2] - 8:15,
74:5
 approximate [1] -
43:5
 April [3] - 34:25,
54:4, 87:23
 area [11] - 38:19,
42:3, 44:20, 50:5,
60:7, 61:10, 61:17,
62:1, 63:11, 66:8,
83:10
 areas [26] - 26:7,
39:8, 39:12, 39:22,
44:20, 46:15, 46:18,
47:1, 48:4, 48:18,
49:19, 50:4, 51:4,
59:13, 61:11, 64:8,
65:17, 66:4, 68:1,
```

```
33:14, 33:17, 33:21,
35:9, 35:23, 36:2,
36:13, 50:21, 63:3,
63:12, 64:1, 65:23,
74:12, 74:18, 75:12,
78:7, 82:9, 82:17,
83:2, 104:15, 112:11
 Assembly [1] - 6:12
 assign [5] - 32:7,
32:8, 40:16, 71:9,
71:14
 assigned [8] - 39:9,
40:2, 40:24, 71:19,
71:23, 71:25, 110:7,
112:9
 assigning [1] -
105:12
 assignment [3] -
18:24, 18:25, 104:14
 assignments [1] -
64:4
 assist [1] - 70:17
 Assistant [1] - 6:3
 associated [1] -
45:22
 assume [4] - 32:15,
51:19, 68:19, 92:11
 assuming [4] -
35:18, 45:11, 45:14,
65:18
 attached [2] - 4:11,
74:11
 attempt [2] - 40:16,
61:10
 attention [7] - 57:15,
71:5, 82:20, 85:14,
86:10, 88:8, 88:13
 Attorney [6] - 4:25,
5:19, 5:22, 6:3, 6:6,
6:9
 attorney [4] - 8:9,
102:15, 114:22,
114:25
 Attorneys [5] - 5:11,
5:19, 6:7, 6:10, 114:9
 attributed [5] - 83:6,
88:20, 89:7, 89:9,
89:15
 August [4] - 32:24,
52:17, 53:17, 54:5
 AutoBound [2] -
15:21, 16:5
 Avenue [1] - 5:23
           В
```

backed [1] - 87:23 BALDUS [1] - 1:3 Baldus [2] - 5:3, 5:21

BALDWIN [1] - 1:10 ballot [1] - 90:22 **BARBERA** [1] - 1:3 Barca [1] - 17:24 **BARLAND** [2] - 1:16, 2:15 base [8] - 14:2, 15:21, 15:24, 16:1, 16:5, 45:6, 50:24 based [27] - 25:22, 29:20, 29:25, 30:9, 30:12, 30:15, 30:23, 31:3, 33:13, 34:16, 35:15, 35:18, 36:21, 37:1, 37:19, 40:9, 41:9, 52:19, 53:5, 53:23, 54:10, 61:14, 61:15, 70:21, 82:13, 106:4 basic [1] - 44:18 **basis** [2] - 13:5, 53:1 Bates [3] - 24:1, 24:16, 24:21 **BECHEN** [1] - 1:3 beginning [3] -27:21, 51:25, 55:20 begins [1] - 24:1 behalf [6] - 5:2, 5:20, 5:24, 6:4, 6:8, 6:11 **BELL** [1] - 1:7 below [1] - 38:6 best [1] - 42:22 **BEST**[1] - 6:10 bet [1] - 31:13 better [3] - 39:11, 58:9, 72:11 between [13] - 26:3, 28:25, 41:23, 41:24, 42:4, 43:6, 50:10, 61:5, 61:12, 62:2, 65:7, 65:11, 69:14 **BIENDSEIL** [1] - 1:3 big [3] - 43:19, 47:5, 88:14 **bill** [6] - 16:11, 16:19, 17:1, 17:5, 17:15, 91:17 bills [1] - 17:13 Bing [1] - 111:2 bipartisan [1] - 92:24 bisected [3] - 29:17, 31:24, 33:16 bit [18] - 26:16, 28:1, 38:9, 38:13, 38:21, 38:22, 42:17, 45:3, 58:5, 58:6, 58:9, 59:10, 82:1, 93:20, 97:3, 97:21, 112:21, 113:3

black [5] - 61:16,

77:8, 77:9, 77:21,

assembly [27] -

99:8, 105:16, 111:6

16:11, 16:12, 16:13,

16:23, 29:21, 30:21,

61:19, 63:8, 64:9, 65:4 block [21] - 29:25, 30:1, 30:3, 30:24, 31:3, 31:4, 31:5, 31:14, 31:21, 35:2, 46:23, 53:24, 54:7, 54:9, 54:11, 87:25, 88:4, 99:13, 104:13 **blocked** [1] - 88:14 blocks [49] - 15:13, 26:20, 27:3, 27:19, 29:24, 30:18, 30:23, 31:2, 31:4, 31:8, 31:17, 31:18, 33:23, 34:13, 35:15, 35:18, 36:21, 36:23, 37:4, 40:13, 41:9, 41:15, 44:8, 46:22, 47:1, 52:22, 52:25, 53:5, 53:7, 53:8, 55:25, 62:18, 62:20, 69:8, 74:9, 87:5, 87:6, 87:10, 87:11, 87:20, 88:20, 89:7, 89:23, 99:7, 99:13, 99:16, 110:24 blue [4] - 60:25, 62:14, 62:19, 62:20 Board [6] - 1:14, 2:2, 2:13, 2:16, 3:21, 5:5 **board** [9] - 23:8, 23:18, 26:6, 35:4, 43:9, 70:22, 75:10, 75:18, 105:8 **BOERNER** [1] - 6:6 **bold** [1] - 86:16 **BOONE** [2] - 1:4 **border** [3] - 54:2, 55:16, 60:16 **bottom** [4] - 24:10, 24:14, 60:9, 85:17 boundaries [30] -41:16, 52:4, 52:6, 53:2, 53:8, 53:10, 54:22, 54:23, 54:25, 56:3, 62:2, 63:1, 63:4, 63:13, 63:17, 64:1, 64:2, 68:3, 74:10, 80:21, 80:22, 81:21, 81:23, 82:8, 82:15, 83:3, 99:9, 99:15, 109:6, 110:23 boundary [10] -31:23, 42:4, 43:23, 45:25, 46:1, 47:15, 50:22, 54:8, 55:12, 61:7 bounded [2] - 44:20, 47:23

BOYNTON [1] - 5:22 brand [1] - 32:7 break [5] - 9:10, 9:11, 9:13, 72:21, 74:16 **BRENNAN** [2] - 1:15, **BRETT** [1] - 1:5 brief [1] - 72:20 briefly [2] - 91:14, 96:1 bringing [1] - 82:19 broadly [1] - 41:24 brought [6] - 10:8, 13:19, 14:16, 14:19, 99:21, 113:8 build [2] - 27:23, 28:19 building [1] - 27:19 **built** [9] - 17:2, 29:24, 37:2, 37:3, 48:3, 50:6, 50:7, 50:24, 52:21 **BUMPUS** [1] - 1:4 Bureau [12] - 11:13, 12:14, 19:5, 42:8, 49:2, 51:21, 52:2, 52:3, 58:2, 98:18, 99:8, 107:2 bureau [6] - 11:18, 12:7, 17:7, 41:10, 56:2, 91:15 bureau's [2] - 57:22, 69:5 bureaus [2] - 91:9, 92:25 busy [2] - 84:6, 94:4

C

calculate [1] - 50:25

calculations [1] -

19:4

Campbell [1] - 6:15 **CANE** [2] - 1:15, 2:14 capacities [1] -23:19 capacity [2] - 1:14, 2:13 caption [2] - 88:10, 98:3 Caption [1] - 1:17 capture [1] - 61:10 captured [1] - 65:6 care [1] - 12:1 carefully [1] - 114:16 **CARLENE** [1] - 1:3 case [10] - 23:16,

72:2, 95:10, 95:13, 103:12, 109:12, 110:19 Case [1] - 2:11 cases [4] - 42:15, 42:16, 53:25, 55:4 **categories** [5] - 10:1, 19:9, 19:10, 20:24 category [1] - 18:1 caused [2] - 107:19, 107:21 causing [1] - 107:15 caveat [1] - 53:12 **CDVS** [1] - 6:15 **CECELIA** [1] - 1:7 census [99] - 15:13, 19:14, 23:4, 25:22, 26:19, 26:20, 27:3, 29:20, 30:1, 30:3, 30:9, 30:13, 30:15, 30:18, 31:8, 31:13, 31:20, 31:21, 32:17, 34:13, 34:23, 35:18, 36:21, 36:23, 37:3, 40:13, 40:19, 40:20, 41:8, 42:2, 42:5, 42:18, 42:19, 44:8, 44:16, 44:22, 45:4, 45:8, 45:18, 45:19, 45:21, 46:21, 46:22, 50:11, 52:22, 52:25, 53:5, 53:7, 53:8, 55:24, 55:25, 57:22, 60:14, 60:16, 61:6, 61:14, 61:15, 62:3, 62:18, 62:20, 66:15, 67:7, 68:18, 69:4, 74:9, 78:11, 87:5, 87:6, 87:10, 87:11, 87:20, 87:25, 88:3, 88:20, 89:7, 89:9, 89:14, 89:16, 89:22, 92:21, 92:22, 95:3, 97:21, 98:10, 99:6, 99:11, 99:12, 99:13, 103:18, 106:25, 107:9, 108:20, 108:21, 108:22, 111:9, 112:3 Census [12] - 12:14, 19:5, 42:8, 49:2, 51:21, 52:2, 52:3, 56:2, 58:2, 98:18, 99:7, 107:2 census-based [3] -

47:15, 82:14, 82:16, 87:25, 88:4, 103:5, 103:10 certify [2] - 114:6, 114:21 change [15] - 74:12, 74:14, 74:20, 75:1, 75:11, 75:16, 76:2, 76:4, 76:25, 77:3. 78:8, 78:10, 82:9, 82:10, 82:17 changed [1] - 54:3 changes [3] - 29:6, 32:4, 83:2 check [1] - 58:12 **CINDY** [1] - 1:3 circle [3] - 17:17, 59:10, 59:16 circumference [4] -80:20, 80:22, 81:21, 81:22 circumstance [1] -87:17 circumstances [2] -31:11, 88:1 city [1] - 46:3 City [2] - 5:12, 114:10 Civil [1] - 3:11 **CLARENCE** [1] - 1:5 clarify [6] - 27:25, 36:8, 78:25, 80:16, 82:12, 102:25 clean [1] - 24:9 cleanup [1] - 38:9 clear [1] - 47:9 CLEEREMAN [1] -1:4 clerk [4] - 64:6, 66:21, 107:25, 108:11 clerks [3] - 26:23, 69:11, 86:21 climb [1] - 111:12 close [1] - 110:7 closed [2] - 88:17, 95:6 coast [4] - 107:18, 108:9, 108:18, 110:6 **COCHRAN** [1] - 1:4 coextensive [1] -21:19 coincide [1] - 62:22 collect [4] - 23:3, 27:22, 109:6, 111:13 collected [2] - 19:11, 25:22, 61:14, 61:15 28:21 census-related [1] -25:25, 112:22

40:13, 99:7 color [1] - 60:25 colored [1] - 60:2 Colored [1] - 3:18 Columbia [2] -48:21, 48:25 combination [1] -67:8 **coming** [3] - 37:1, 97:3, 107:7 commencing [1] -5:14 commission [1] -115:9 commissioned [1] -114:5 committee [3] - 92:1, 92:4, 92:8 **common** [1] - 48:2 communication [2] -75:15, 77:25 communities [1] community [1] - 88:3 Company [1] - 6:15 compare [2] - 28:15, 38:2 compared [3] - 50:1, 96:23, 98:20 comparing [3] -45:17, 80:20, 81:20 comparison [2] -37:23, 38:2 complete [3] - 29:1, 34:1, 97:3 completed [3] -29:15, 33:4, 35:11 complex [2] -111:11, 111:14 complexity [1] -111:15 complicate [1] -113:2 complicated [3] -84:5, 111:10, 111:20 complicating [1] -90:19 computer [2] - 12:4, 114:18 computer-aided [1] -114:18 computer-related [1] - 12:4 concern [2] - 106:19, 107:7 concerned [2] -108:5, 112:8 concerning [1] -114:14

66:12

82:16 concluded [1] - 82:7 conclusion [1] -88:25 conclusions [2] -83:2, 83:5 conduct [1] - 82:16 conducted [4] - 39:5, 80:19, 81:19, 86:3 conflict [3] - 86:15, 87:5, 87:10 conflicting [1] -74:10 confused [2] - 36:9, 76:21 congress [1] - 16:25 congressional [34] -16:22, 16:24, 16:25, 29:17, 29:21, 30:22, 30:25, 33:14, 33:17, 33:22, 33:24, 35:9, 35:14, 35:21, 36:13, 51:4, 63:3, 63:12, 64:2, 65:22, 68:3, 68:6, 71:10, 71:15, 71:23, 74:12, 74:18, 75:12, 78:8, 80:24, 81:24, 82:6, 82:10, 112:10 **consist** [4] - 31:8, 31:10, 31:11, 103:3 contact [1] - 26:24 contacted [1] - 26:22 contain [1] - 15:8 contained [5] -15:17, 20:5, 46:16, 46:22, 63:1 **containing** [1] - 3:15 context [3] - 67:9, 67:11, 89:8 contiguous [2] -65:12, 65:16 continue [3] - 81:15, 82:5, 93:23 Continued [3] - 1:17, 3:25, 6:1 control [3] - 21:24, 22:2, 22:6 controversy [1] -114:15 convene [1] - 93:23 convened [4] -91:21, 92:8, 92:9, 93:22 conversation [2] -75:14, 88:24 conversations [2] -70:21, 89:2 cooperation [1] -

coordinate [1] - 48:4 copied [1] - 81:2 copies [6] - 4:11, 14:19, 24:9, 24:25, 99:25, 100:7 copy [14] - 9:2, 9:15, 14:9, 23:25, 24:9, 24:23, 24:24, 25:1, 59:8, 70:9, 73:3, 79:9, 79:20, 102:3 corner [2] - 63:10, 80:2 correct [70] - 9:20, 10:3, 10:9, 11:5, 11:13, 13:9, 14:17, 14:20, 18:21, 19:1, 20:2, 20:6, 20:14, 21:17, 26:13, 27:13, 27:20, 30:2, 32:25, 33:8, 33:18, 37:24, 40:2, 40:5, 40:17, 43:13, 47:7, 47:16, 47:20, 49:18, 51:8, 52:11, 54:17, 56:20, 58:14, 58:16, 60:2, 61:17, 62:11, 62:15, 63:4, 63:19, 73:1, 78:13, 79:16, 80:13, 84:17, 85:23, 93:4, 93:14, 97:9, 97:11, 98:1, 98:5, 99:18, 100:25, 101:3, 101:16, 103:5, 103:8, 103:12, 103:16, 103:18, 106:5, 108:20, 108:23, 110:18, 110:19, 112:17 corrected [1] - 47:18 corrections [5] -86:22, 87:4, 88:16, 111:25, 112:15 correctly [5] - 61:3, 62:24, 89:10, 89:15, 110:11 correspond [1] **cost** [1] - 13:5 cost-recovery [1] -13:5 coterminous [1] -53:9 counsel [9] - 4:11, 8:5, 8:21, 8:25, 24:24, 84:21, 100:3, 114:22, 114:25

counties [13] -28:18, 28:22, 29:2, 38:5, 41:19, 50:1, 50:2, 51:8, 51:9, 51:17, 51:20, 80:20, 81:20 **COUNTY** [1] - 114:2 county [16] - 26:24, 26:25, 27:1, 30:7, 38:6, 41:11, 43:8, 44:2, 44:25, 47:19, 47:21, 48:6, 48:15, 49:3, 80:22, 81:23 County [12] - 5:12, 22:10, 48:7, 48:21, 48:25, 49:1, 60:22, 61:6, 61:13, 62:3, 114:10 couple [5] - 7:13, 59:11, 84:25, 102:11, 109:22 COURT [2] - 1:1, 70:4 court [10] - 7:20, 10:15, 34:15, 36:1, 36:4, 79:8, 82:2, 91:1, 109:12, 109:15 **Court** [1] - 5:6 courts [1] - 34:17 cover [1] - 96:7 covered [1] - 96:6 cram [1] - 19:8 create [12] - 18:11, 25:7, 25:9, 25:10, 25:24, 27:10, 28:4, 44:7, 47:22, 52:6, 90:22, 90:23 created [43] - 16:4, 16:10, 16:21, 17:6, 17:8, 17:10, 18:12, 18:19, 25:23, 26:17, 27:5, 28:5, 30:6, 30:19, 34:11, 34:12, 37:4, 37:5, 39:24, 40:9, 41:3, 41:8, 48:8, 48:11, 50:12, 52:18, 53:22, 54:22, 54:23, 54:25, 57:19, 70:14, 70:20, 73:9, 86:14, 90:24, 91:7, 91:8, 91:10, 100:22, 102:3 creating [4] - 27:12, 35:10, 37:11, 37:19 creation [1] - 52:10 credit [2] - 97:22, 98:13 **curly** [1] - 84:14 current [4] - 19:19, 53:10, 91:18, 98:17

custody [3] - 21:24, 22:2, 22:6 custom [4] - 16:3, 16:10, 17:2, 18:10 cut [1] - 37:7 D **DANE** [1] - 114:2 Dane [6] - 5:12, 47:21, 48:7, 48:21, 49:1, 114:11 **DANIEL** [1] - 6:6 dark [2] - 84:13 data [132] - 12:14, 14:2, 15:6, 15:8, 15:9, 15:12, 19:4, 19:5, 19:6, 19:17, 19:19, 23:3, 23:4, 23:8, 23:11, 25:24, 26:7, 26:21, 28:10, 28:22, 28:23, 29:4, 29:7, 29:20, 29:23, 30:10, 30:13, 30:15, 34:23, 35:2, 35:3, 36:20, 36:22, 37:3, 37:16, 38:9, 38:11, 38:15, 38:22, 40:20, 41:12, 42:1, 42:2, 42:9, 42:12, 42:18, 42:19, 42:20, 43:7, 43:8, 44:2, 44:16, 44:22, 45:2, 45:4, 45:5, 45:16, 45:17, 45:19, 45:20, 45:21, 47:19, 48:12, 48:16, 48:17, 48:23, 49:18, 50:1, 50:2. 51:18. 51:21. 51:22, 51:25, 52:2, 52:19, 52:22, 55:17, 55:18, 55:21, 55:23, 55:24, 61:6, 61:14, 62:3, 65:8, 65:12, 65:14, 67:7, 67:8, 68:18, 69:5, 69:17, 78:17, 82:13, 87:23, 89:14, 89:16, 89:25, 95:3, 98:11, 99:1, 99:2, 99:6, 99:11, 100:23, 102:2, 103:18, 107:9, 108:20, 108:21, 108:22, 110:19, 110:20, 110:21, 110:25, 111:2, 111:13, 111:17,

26:5, 26:13, 26:15, 28:8, 28:15, 28:16, 28:20, 29:1, 33:7, 37:21, 38:1, 38:3, 39:24, 39:25, 40:15, 41:22, 41:23, 41:24, 45:16, 47:25, 48:10, 48:13, 48:14, 48:16, 49:5, 53:10, 54:2, 55:3, 55:13, 61:15, 68:22, 69:3, 69:7, 98:16, 98:17, 108:3, 112:23 datasets [41] - 3:17, 19:19, 22:14, 22:16, 23:3, 23:12, 25:14, 26:1, 26:2, 28:24, 32:1, 35:5, 37:24, 38:5, 38:6, 39:8, 44:9, 44:10, 44:14, 44:18, 44:24, 45:10, 45:13, 48:3, 49:20, 50:23, 55:1, 55:9, 56:4, 57:22, 58:4, 59:22, 68:22, 68:24, 69:15, 89:22, 90:1, 98:14, 98:23, 98:24, 112:7 date [13] - 20:1, 29:16, 34:4, 37:12, 39:1, 51:10, 51:15, 55:7, 73:18, 75:19, 92:12, 101:15, 111:19 dated [11] - 3:13, 3:19, 3:23, 4:6, 4:8, 10:24, 74:11, 79:1, 80:5, 81:5, 101:5 David [4] - 76:18, 78:16, 84:12 **DAVID** [2] - 1:15, 2:14 **DAVIS**[1] - 1:5 **De** [1] - 5:24 **DE** [1] - 2:8 **deadline** [1] - 33:3 deal [7] - 42:12, 66:14, 66:15, 77:14, 78:11, 78:18, 111:20 dealing [3] - 38:19, 74:9, 84:2 December [10] -51:11, 51:16, 52:24, 73:16, 75:22, 75:23, 84:8, 101:5, 105:9, 106:10 decennial [2] -32:17, 111:9 decision [4] - 36:1,

Defendants [6] - 2:3, 2:6, 2:17, 5:5, 6:4, 6:8 defendants' [1] -94:21 **Defendants'** [1] - 4:5 **DEININGER** [2] -1:15, 2:14 demographic [2] -12:9, 12:22 Department [3] -19:7, 19:13 **DEPARTMENT** [1] -6:3 depict [2] - 40:12, depicted [3] - 63:19, 64:2, 99:9 depicts [1] - 60:16 deposed [2] - 7:9, 95:15 deposing [1] - 57:11 **Deposition** [1] - 3:11 deposition [15] -4:24, 7:11, 7:19, 7:24, 7:25, 8:4, 9:3, 9:20, 13:23, 15:15, 21:6, 80:1, 95:20, 114:18, 114:24 **DEPOSITION** [2] -1:18, 5:1 **Der** [22] - 3:13, 4:7, 4:8, 6:12, 7:7, 9:15, 10:15, 10:24, 14:14, 24:12, 25:1, 59:8, 70:7, 72:20, 79:8, 90:3, 94:13, 95:22, 99:25, 100:7, 100:14, 102:14 **DER** [5] - 1:19, 3:3, 5:1, 7:1, 114:12 derived [1] - 69:4 describe [5] - 12:16, 44:5, 91:13, 103:4, 106:23 described [1] - 107:9 description [1] -22:22 Description [2] -3:10, 4:2 deserve [1] - 97:23 designation [1] -60:14 designer [1] - 16:6 detachment [2] -53:25, 87:22 determination [1] -112:5 **determine** [4] - 26:3, 46:24, 46:25, 78:7 determined [2] -

62:3, 69:11 **DEUREN** [1] - 6:6 develop [2] - 41:16, 109:7 developed [1] -109:4 **developing** [1] - 95:4 deviation [2] - 16:18, 35:17 deviations [1] -35:16 **Diez** [5] - 4:8, 101:14, 101:15, 101:18, 104:24 difference [24] -26:3, 26:7, 28:25, 34:8, 39:10, 39:12, 39:13, 43:6, 46:18, 48:22, 49:2, 49:12, 49:20, 50:4, 50:5, 50:17, 51:4, 61:12, 62:1, 65:23, 77:7, 111:23 differences [9] -23:12, 42:1, 46:14, 50:9, 54:12, 59:17, 65:7, 65:11, 69:14 different [22] - 8:1, 18:24, 23:9, 28:22, 39:9, 39:13, 41:17, 48:4, 48:5, 48:18, 49:8, 52:3, 54:24, 56:4, 59:25, 60:1, 65:12, 65:16, 71:24, 111:1, 112:21 differing [1] - 23:3 difficulties [1] -113:1 difficulty [1] - 46:4 directed [1] - 102:4 director [1] - 73:25 Director [2] - 2:1, 2:15 dirt [1] - 42:11 disaggregated [1] -15:12 disaggregating [1] -19:18 disaggregation [1] -19:17 disagree [1] - 99:5 disclaim [1] - 99:10 Disclosures [1] - 4:5 disclosures [2] -94:22, 100:23 discrepancies [2] -41:23, 112:16 discrepancy [3] -

42:4, 61:5, 62:2

discussing [1] -

59:14 discussion [1] -83:24 discussions [3] -68:1, 89:17, 106:4 disenfranchisemen **t** [3] - 18:11, 18:12, 18:14 **DISTRICT** [2] - 1:1, 1:1 district [43] - 13:4, 16:12, 16:15, 18:18, 18:19, 18:24, 18:25, 27:3, 27:4, 29:21, 30:21, 33:18, 33:25, 34:17, 35:9, 50:21, 51:5, 52:6, 53:1, 54:23, 63:3, 63:13, 63:17, 64:2, 64:4, 66:12, 66:20, 71:10, 71:15, 74:14, 76:5, 76:24, 78:9, 82:17, 83:3, 109:11, 112:6, 112:10, 112:11, 112:12 **District** [2] - 5:6, 5:7 districts [36] - 16:21, 16:24, 16:25, 27:19, 27:23, 28:4, 33:22, 34:16, 36:7, 36:13, 40:1, 40:17, 40:23, 41:14, 41:17, 68:4, 68:7, 71:18, 71:24, 71:25, 80:24, 81:24, 82:6, 82:9, 82:10, 83:2, 86:22, 88:18, 88:21, 89:8, 89:13, 89:18, 93:24, 105:13 **Districts** [1] - 86:14 divided [2] - 33:13, 54:9 division [1] - 62:20 divisions [1] - 62:18 Doc [2] - 19:14, 19:15 document [57] - 9:9, 9:16, 9:17, 10:16, 10:19, 10:20, 10:22, 19:10, 19:17, 22:8, 22:15, 22:24, 23:21, 23:25, 24:1, 24:3, 24:4, 25:2, 43:16, 43:17, 43:21, 51:12, 51:15, 56:25, 58:10, 58:12, 58:19, 59:9, 70:7, 70:12, 72:3, 72:6, 72:12, 72:25, 73:3, 73:5, 73:8, 73:9, 78:24, 79:5, 79:9, 79:12, 79:25, 80:3,

documentation [2] -97:17, 97:20 documented [1] -74:10 Documents [1] -3:12 documents [27] -3:15, 10:2, 10:6, 10:8, 10:23, 19:3, 20:13, 21:23, 23:13, 23:15, 23:19, 24:15, 56:12, 57:25, 58:16, 96:21, 97:16, 99:17, 99:20, 100:1, 100:8, 100:14, 101:14, 101:22, 103:4, 103:7, 103:10 **DOJ**[1] - 19:12 done [23] - 10:5, 34:9, 34:18, 35:10, 35:15, 35:19, 41:7, 45:1, 48:12, 51:11, 51:15, 52:9, 57:4, 57:7, 66:7, 69:18, 77:18, 77:19, 88:6, 92:20, 102:12, 108:6, 111:24 dots [10] - 61:16, 61:19, 63:8, 63:15, 63:25, 64:9, 65:4, 65:20, 66:9, 66:11 dotted [1] - 63:22 **Doug** [1] - 7:14 Douglas [1] - 4:25 **DOUGLAS** [1] - 5:19 down [15] - 7:21, 11:2, 15:4, 18:5, 35:17, 38:6, 42:10, 49:23, 50:19, 58:24, 63:10, 74:8, 81:9, 82:1, 85:17 downstairs [1] -58:24 **DPW** [1] - 2:12 draft [5] - 16:19, 17:5, 17:12, 17:16, 22:15 drafting [3] - 16:11, 17:1, 91:17 draw [7] - 27:2, 41:13, 54:7, 71:5, 83:1, 86:10, 88:13 drawing [1] - 36:6 drawn [1] - 53:4 drew [1] - 34:15 drive [21] - 3:15, 14:15, 14:16, 14:20,

80:8, 81:2, 85:3, 90:2,

90:3, 94:13, 94:19,

95:18, 97:13, 97:14,

100:22, 103:1, 110:15

15:5, 15:17, 20:5, 20:8, 20:22, 21:1, 21:5, 22:19, 56:22, 67:19, 72:8, 75:20, 78:15, 84:16, 99:15, 103:21 drives [6] - 14:6, 14:10, 14:23, 103:15, 103:23, 104:23 dry [1] - 19:3 due [2] - 29:6, 54:3 **DUFFY** [1] - 2:5 duly [3] - 7:2, 114:4, 114:13 during [3] - 23:9, 27:21, 93:18 duties [1] - 41:4 Ε

e-mail [2] - 22:10, 84:10 **e-mails** [5] - 22:17, 69:24, 75:20, 78:12, 78:14 early [2] - 39:1, 51:16 East [3] - 5:11, 5:20, 114:10 **EASTERN** [1] - 1:1 **Eastern** [1] - 5:7 eastern [1] - 109:11 **ECKSTEIN** [1] - 1:5 edges [1] - 53:7 effect [2] - 58:11, 69:16 effects [1] - 68:4 effort [2] - 13:9, 111:13 eight [3] - 61:25, 63:16, 92:17 either [4] - 32:7, 63:25, 81:1, 112:5 election [7] - 15:12, 18:19, 19:17, 19:19, 76:17, 88:17, 112:1 **electronic** [1] - 20:4 Elm [1] - 44:21 elsewhere [1] -104:6 **ELVIRA**[1] - 1:4 employed [3] -34:24, 114:22, 115:1 employee [1] -114:25 enacted [7] - 35:22, 35:23, 52:12, 52:15, 53:16, 54:15, 54:17 **Encoding** [1] - 107:3

encounter [1] - 87:9

VIDEOI	APE DEPOSITION
encountered [1] -	examples [1] - 48:19
112:25	excellent [2] - 67:1,
encountering [1] -	72:13
108:6	
end [2] - 46:17,	except [1] - 16:23 exhibit [16] - 9:6,
53:20	13:18, 14:11, 14:22,
ended [2] - 46:16,	14:25, 23:23, 24:10,
66:2	24:23, 58:20, 63:2, 73:15, 78:23, 79:18,
enterprise [1] - 12:1	, , , , ,
enumerated [2] -	95:19, 95:20, 102:22
65:10, 85:18	Exhibit [78] - 9:7,
enumeration [1] -	9:16, 9:23, 9:24, 10:6, 10:12, 10:13, 10:16,
67:16	
envelope [1] - 105:1	10:22, 11:5, 13:22,
envelopes [1] -	13:24, 14:1, 14:12, 14:15, 14:23, 15:15,
104:21	
equator [2] - 110:9,	17:19, 18:2, 20:6, 20:13, 24:18, 25:2,
110:14	25:5, 25:11, 25:20,
ERIC [1] - 6:9	42:23, 56:18, 57:1,
ERICA [1] - 2:9	57:15, 59:5, 59:9,
error [7] - 50:25,	59:18, 61:24, 64:3,
107:22, 108:1, 108:6,	64:18, 64:23, 64:24,
108:11, 108:12,	65:2, 67:15, 70:3,
108:16	70:5, 70:8, 70:19,
errors [6] - 57:21,	71:6, 72:18, 72:21,
58:1, 69:13, 69:14,	73:4, 73:20, 73:23,
78:14, 113:5	77:24, 79:6, 79:10,
especially [2] -	79:13, 80:1, 85:2,
35:13, 113:3	85:15, 88:8, 90:7,
essence [1] - 89:23	90:12, 94:11, 94:14,
essentially [1] -	94:16, 94:19, 95:22,
82:21	96:2, 99:23, 100:15,
established [2] -	100:16, 100:20,
43:22, 43:24	101:9, 101:13,
estimate [4] - 54:10,	102:23, 102:24,
68:8, 68:12, 69:17	103:3, 104:13, 105:6
estimated [1] - 82:18	exhibits [5] - 4:11,
estimates [1] - 67:25	78:20, 99:22, 100:1,
et [4] - 5:3, 5:5, 5:21,	103:16
5:24	exist [2] - 41:23,
EVANJELINA [1] -	107:10
1:4	existed [1] - 52:19
eventually [1] -	existence [1] - 55:1
43:12	exists [1] - 22:1
exact [7] - 28:8,	expect [1] - 111:5
34:22, 38:25, 73:17,	expires [1] - 115:9
75:19, 92:12, 92:16	explain [7] - 59:23,
exactly [8] - 45:2,	68:11, 80:15, 91:2,
45:12, 50:13, 55:3,	99:17, 100:22, 100:23
73:12, 81:2, 105:15,	explains [5] - 19:10,
105:18	19:16, 19:18, 22:15,
EXAMINATION [3] -	57:20
7:5, 102:19, 110:1	explicit [1] - 72:5
Examination [1] -	extra [1] - 102:3
3:4	
examination [3] -	F
3:5, 102:6, 114:17	•
examined [1] -	
114:16	facets [1] - 27:16
example [1] - 107:17	

```
fact [4] - 71:22,
80:19, 81:18, 81:19
 factors [3] - 38:17,
68:14, 108:15
 fair [6] - 18:25, 34:7,
60:7, 61:7, 61:8, 86:7
 fairly [1] - 113:4
 Falk [1] - 84:23
 fall [1] - 63:16
 familiar [2] - 84:24,
91:3
 far [8] - 29:11, 34:4,
44:19, 89:24, 94:1,
97:6, 108:4, 109:9
 february [1] - 1:20
 February [5] - 3:14,
5:13, 10:25, 114:8,
115:5
 federal [5] - 19:7,
34:15, 90:25, 91:3,
109:11
 feet [7] - 50:21, 58:8,
65:17, 97:19, 98:18,
98:22
 fell [4] - 50:3, 50:16,
51:3, 66:7
 felt [1] - 106:18
 few [6] - 20:24,
23:19, 99:20, 100:4,
102:7, 102:16
 fields [3] - 12:4, 19:6
 figure [9] - 37:9,
44:23, 47:2, 54:21,
66:5, 66:19, 69:9,
77:17, 83:8
 File [1] - 1:12
 file [6] - 39:16, 46:17,
47:4, 103:25, 104:14,
104:16
 filed [1] - 4:24
 files [9] - 15:14,
19:22, 20:4, 26:5,
84:15, 103:8, 103:14,
110:22
 final [8] - 16:18,
16:25, 35:8, 37:13,
88:18, 89:18, 89:25,
93:24
 finality [1] - 29:9
 financially [1] -
115:1
 fine [2] - 37:8, 57:10
 finish [1] - 73:13
 finished [6] - 35:4,
54:14, 54:16, 55:6,
56:17, 61:21
 Finley [2] - 1:21, 5:8
 FINLEY [1] - 114:3
 fire [1] - 44:13
```

```
37:5, 39:1, 42:25,
43:3, 52:22, 56:11,
56:18, 61:4, 64:18,
64:23, 65:6, 71:8,
73:16, 73:20, 74:7,
74:17, 75:23, 88:14,
93:21, 96:4, 96:12
 fit [8] - 44:17, 45:4,
45:9, 45:18, 48:10,
48:12, 51:24, 55:8
 Fitzgerald [4] - 6:12,
6:12, 17:25
 five [4] - 61:25,
63:15, 85:18, 85:22
 flash [14] - 20:22,
20:25, 21:5, 22:19,
56:22, 67:19, 72:8,
75:20, 78:15, 84:16,
103:15, 103:21,
103:23, 104:23
 flow [2] - 29:7, 35:20
 focus [2] - 13:14,
63:21
 focusing [2] - 13:11,
66:9
 folder [18] - 14:4,
14:6, 15:16, 20:19,
20:21, 21:2, 21:3,
21:6, 21:12, 22:11,
28:9, 28:11, 46:16,
69:24, 84:10, 104:2
 folders [7] - 15:7,
15:8, 20:5, 21:7,
21:10, 104:1, 104:10
 follow [9] - 31:20,
42:16, 55:2, 62:13,
77:5, 89:22, 102:17,
110:17, 111:7
 follow-up [3] - 77:5,
102:17, 111:7
 followed [1] - 32:21
 following [2] - 51:5,
114:11
 follows [2] - 7:3,
48:21
 forenoon [2] - 5:14,
114:8
 form [3] - 36:17,
40:7, 69:2
 formed [1] - 92:19
 forms [1] - 108:1
 forth [1] - 13:23
 forward [1] - 113:10
 forwarded [4] - 85:5,
85:7, 85:8, 85:11
 four [6] - 14:19, 18:2,
35:1, 61:25, 63:15,
65:21
```

21:19, 23:24, 25:6, fourth [1] - 50:20 25:11, 25:20, 32:18, frame [1] - 93:12 Fredonia [1] - 6:16 free [2] - 8:14, 41:2 Friday [2] - 85:8 FRIEDRICH [1] -6:10 front [12] - 10:17, 14:24, 25:3, 57:25, 58:10, 72:6, 72:12, 79:10, 79:19, 80:13, 100:16, 102:23 **FRONTERA** [1] - 2:8 Frontera [1] - 5:24 frustrating [1] -47:11 full [2] - 13:23, 98:7 G **GAB** [79] - 3:17, 3:22, 3:23, 22:9, 22:14, 22:15, 24:1, 25:13, 28:17, 28:21, 37:24, 38:1, 38:4, 38:24, 39:16, 41:21, 41:23, 41:24, 42:21, 43:9, 43:17, 43:18, 44:3, 45:12, 45:16, 47:4, 47:20, 48:17, 48:24, 51:13, 51:18, 57:5, 57:10, 58:13, 58:16, 59:22, 64:6, 64:14, 64:16, 65:7, 65:11, 66:3, 71:8, 71:14, 71:22, 72:4, 72:25, 73:5, 73:10, 73:19, 76:20, 76:21, 77:12, 77:18, 78:15, 79:1, 80:18, 81:4, 81:18, 82:13, 83:17, 83:20, 84:9, 85:6, 86:20, 88:10, 89:21, 96:4, 105:12, 105:15, 105:21, 106:13, 106:19, 111:16, 112:23, 112:24 GAB's [4] - 74:8, 77:14, 82:18, 89:25

first [29] - 7:2, 15:6,

general's [1] -102:15 generally [3] - 57:24, 96:8, 96:10 generated [1] - 22:9 gentleman [1] -84:13 **geocode** [4] - 62:6, 108:3, 108:17, 110:18 geocoded [9] -39:14, 39:19, 47:4, 49:19, 49:21, 49:22, 61:20, 65:24, 86:5 geocoder [2] - 108:6, 110:25 geocodes [2] -49:22, 107:17 geocoding [9] -107:24, 108:5, 108:6, 108:13, 108:15, 110:17, 110:18, 110:21, 111:4 geographers [1] -Geographic [1] -12:7 geographic [5] -12:9, 12:22, 38:19, 107:1, 107:3 geography [5] -15:11, 16:20, 26:20, 56:1 **GERALD** [2] - 1:15, 2:14 GIS [10] - 12:18, 12:19, 13:8, 26:24, 41:5, 44:9, 44:18, 48:3, 88:1, 113:5 given [20] - 9:19, 14:3, 17:20, 18:2, 29:5, 41:19, 45:8, 45:15, 48:16, 51:22, 52:23, 64:12, 69:20, 69:23, 70:15, 89:20, 98:24, 98:25, 100:23, 114:19 **GLADYS** [1] - 1:6 globally [1] - 51:14 GLORIA [1] - 1:7 goal [8] - 26:6, 43:4, 43:11, 43:16, 43:17, 43:21, 82:24 Godfrey [2] - 5:11, **GODFREY** [1] - 5:19 government [10] -11:10, 23:7, 23:18, 25:25, 26:5, 43:9, 70:22, 75:10, 75:18, 105:8

Government [6] -1:13, 2:2, 2:12, 2:16, 3:21, 5:4 grab [1] - 58:24 Graddie [1] - 100:6 grasp [1] - 47:5 Grassel [1] - 78:16 great [2] - 81:14, 94:8 green [7] - 46:19, 59:13, 61:9, 61:11, 61:17, 64:8, 65:17 green-shaded [5] -59:13, 61:9, 61:11, 61:17, 64:8 ground [1] - 7:14 Group [1] - 4:3 group [22] - 20:17, 41:8, 65:10, 83:15, 90:14, 90:16, 90:21, 90:22, 91:7, 91:21, 92:9, 92:14, 92:19, 92:24, 93:6, 93:13, 93:16, 93:18, 93:21, 93:23, 94:5, 112:13 grouped [1] - 31:1 grouping [2] - 30:18, 31:16 groupings [2] -31:16, 31:18 groups [1] - 7:15 guess [6] - 36:7, 36:8, 36:20, 60:6, 63:5, 96:24 quidance [4] - 19:8, 19:12, 19:13, 41:9 **GWENDOLYNNE** [1] - 1:10

H-e-i-n [1] - 75:8 hair [2] - 84:13, 84:14 half [1] - 60:9 hand [6] - 14:9, 63:10, 79:20, 80:2, 95:18, 115:4 handed [7] - 10:15, 25:1, 77:12, 79:8, 79:25, 100:7, 100:14 handing [9] - 9:15, 14:14, 23:25, 24:23, 59:8, 70:7, 73:3, 94:13, 99:25 handle [1] - 13:4 handled [4] - 111:21, 111:23, 113:7, 113:9 hard [1] - 42:8

harder [1] - 67:12 hardware [2] - 109:7, 109:16 harmony [3] - 60:15, 60:17, 60:21 Harmony [2] - 61:7, 62:2 hate [1] - 35:12 head [1] - 106:1 heading [4] - 86:16, 88:10 hear [1] - 76:1 heard [3] - 48:19, 58:6, 74:5 Heather [1] - 6:16 heavily [1] - 12:12 Heim [1] - 75:5 Hein [8] - 75:4, 75:5, 75:6, 75:9, 75:11, 75:15, 76:13, 84:12 hein [1] - 75:7 help [6] - 23:5, 41:3, 66:23, 88:5, 91:16, 113:1 helped [2] - 66:25, 109:5 helpful [1] - 109:18 helping [3] - 27:14, 111:17, 111:18 hereby [1] - 114:6 hereto [1] - 115:1 hereunto [1] - 115:3 holiday [1] - 75:22 honest [1] - 96:17 hope [2] - 47:10, 106:12 horrible [1] - 33:12 HOUGH [1] - 1:5 house [1] - 66:18 huge [1] - 111:13

Н

idea [9] - 57:8, 64:5, 66:6, 66:14, 77:8, 85:24, 86:5, 101:19, 105:16 identical [1] - 14:24 identification [11] -9:8, 10:14, 14:13, 24:19, 59:6, 70:6, 72:19, 79:7, 90:8, 94:12, 99:24 **Identified** [2] - 3:10, identified [20] - 10:6, 15:14, 19:22, 20:9, 20:13, 43:13, 61:23,

hundred [1] - 78:12

I

63:2, 63:12, 64:8, 66:4, 66:10, 70:9, 77:7, 78:24, 79:12, 94:24, 97:4, 97:10, 101:23 identifies [2] - 10:1, 39:25 identify [16] - 9:17, 10:19, 23:22, 25:19, 43:14, 49:10, 59:18, 69:25, 70:12, 73:8, 77:21, 82:25, 90:12, 100:19, 100:20, 110:10 **III** [1] - 1:5 impact [2] - 56:8, 64:3 implement [1] -112:24 impossible [2] -17:5, 17:12 improvements [2] -57:21, 58:1 inaccuracy [2] -79:1, 80:16 Inc [1] - 5:24 INC [1] - 2:8 include [2] - 104:15, 104:17 included [13] -15:20, 15:21, 16:1, 16:5, 16:20, 17:23, 18:13, 57:18, 72:3, 75:20, 78:14, 94:5, 104:13 includes [2] - 15:10, 92:25 including [1] - 27:17 incorrect [6] - 34:14, 40:8, 82:8, 82:15, 88:20, 89:7 increased [3] - 58:5,

58:6, 97:21 individual [3] -23:17, 46:11, 112:9 individuals [3] -18:2, 103:5, 104:24 inform [5] - 43:20, 64:21, 70:23, 83:17, 91:18 Information [1] -12:7 information [12] -23:7, 28:2, 28:3, 29:2, 34:16, 35:6, 64:10, 64:17, 91:17, 95:4, 96:18, 104:20 informed [4] - 70:25, 73:10, 73:14, 73:19

Initial [1] - 4:5

initial [3] - 36:10, 85:6, 94:22 inside [3] - 63:22, 63:25, 104:20 **instructed** [1] - 8:9 integrated [1] -107:2 intended [3] - 39:24, 56:9, 71:14 interested [1] - 115:2 interface [1] - 17:15 internal [5] - 12:5, 12:6, 46:2, 51:12 interpret [3] - 29:13, 44:17, 67:12 interpretation [3] -45:3, 55:11, 69:16 intersect [2] - 26:8, 69:8 intersected [3] -29:16, 33:20, 112:3 Intervenor [2] - 1:11, Intervenor-**Defendants** [1] - 2:6 Intervenor-Plaintiffs [1] - 1:11 involved [8] - 12:12, 13:7, 13:8, 32:14, 32:19, 83:17, 87:21, 108:25 involvement [1] -

78:6 issue [3] - 77:14, 96:15, 107:15 issued [3] - 3:13, 10:23, 26:24 issues [3] - 12:4, 90:17, 97:4 item [2] - 17:17, 104:4 items [2] - 103:14, 104:3 itself [1] - 101:24

J

JACQUELINE [1] -5:22 **JAMES**[1] - 2:4 James [1] - 6:15 January [32] - 4:4, 20:19, 70:1, 70:16, 71:13, 72:24, 77:24, 78:5, 79:2, 79:15, 80:6, 80:12, 80:16, 80:17, 81:5, 81:6, 81:11, 83:14, 85:3, 90:10, 90:13, 92:15,

93:8, 96:7, 96:11, 96:15, 96:23, 97:2, 97:14, 98:1, 99:4 jargon [1] - 19:15 JCLO_[5] - 90:21, 90:22, 91:22, 91:23, 91:25 **JEANNE** [1] - 1:7 **Jeff** [8] - 3:20, 6:12, 73:25, 74:2, 74:3, 83:16, 90:17, 106:7 **John** [2] - 4:8, 101:14 **JOHNSON** [1] - 1:5 joint [3] - 91:24, 92:1, 92:4 JOSE [1] - 2:9 JPS [1] - 2:12 JPS-DPW-RMD[1] -2:12 JR [2] - 2:4, 2:4 judges [2] - 91:3, 109:19 JUDY [1] - 1:7 july [1] - 115:10 jump [1] - 18:5 **JUSTICE** [1] - 6:3 Justice [3] - 19:7, 19:8, 19:13

K

Kahn [2] - 5:11, 114:9 **KAHN** [1] - 5:19 Keane [1] - 87:18 keep [1] - 15:18 **Keith** [4] - 4:6, 100:6, 100:24, 101:7 **KELLY** [2] - 6:6, 67:3 **KENNEDY** [2] - 2:1, 2:15 **KEVIN** [2] - 2:1, 2:15 kind [9] - 12:25, 19:11, 48:14, 51:24, 75:25, 76:1, 77:2, 77:15, 85:10 **KIND** [1] - 1:10 kinds [1] - 11:23 knowledge [4] -34:15, 36:25, 38:4, 114:14 knows [1] - 102:7 **KRESBACH** [1] - 1:6

L

labeled [1] - 39:13 lack [1] - 39:10 laid [1] - 69:7 land [1] - 112:9 Lane [1] - 6:16 **LANGE** [1] - 1:6 last [11] - 9:23, 23:16, 25:7, 25:8, 32:8, 32:13, 32:14, 71:5, 78:23, 88:13, 93:20 lately [1] - 84:6 law [1] - 26:21 **Law** [7] - 5:11, 5:19, 5:22, 6:7, 6:10, 15:9, 114:9 lawful [1] - 5:2 lawsuit [2] - 7:16, 13:13 lawyer [1] - 29:13 lawyers [4] - 8:5, 24:13, 84:20, 91:2 layer [2] - 61:13, 61:14 layers [1] - 78:13 **LAZAR** [4] - 6:3, 102:14, 109:20, 113:13 **Lazar** [8] - 3:5, 101:10, 101:11, 101:20, 102:2, 102:6, 102:15, 102:20 **Leader** [1] - 6:11 leaders [5] - 3:19, 35:1, 70:23, 106:2, 106:14 leadership [25] -14:3, 17:20, 17:22, 19:21, 22:15, 43:20, 52:23, 64:11, 64:12, 64:21, 69:23, 70:15, 71:1, 73:11, 73:14, 73:19, 77:16, 77:19, 78:1. 83:9. 83:11. 83:14, 83:18, 83:23, 84:3 leadership's [1] -82:19 least [5] - 46:24, 56:9, 63:2, 66:25, 93:7 led [1] - 90:16 left [1] - 7:21 **Legal** [1] - 6:15 legislation [2] - 34:3 legislative [47] -3:19, 12:11, 12:23,

40:18, 41:10, 41:13, 43:20, 52:23, 54:23, 64:12, 68:3, 68:6, 69:23, 70:15, 70:23, 71:9, 71:15, 71:23, 74:14, 76:5, 76:24, 78:1, 78:9, 80:23, 81:24, 82:19, 83:13, 83:18, 83:23, 91:15, 91:24, 92:2, 92:4, 105:12, 106:2, 106:14, 109:10, 109:17 Legislative [1] -11:12 legislators [2] -12:11, 91:19 **legislature** [18] - 4:3, 11:22, 11:24, 12:3, 12:10, 28:23, 29:5, 34:20, 34:22, 35:1, 35:22, 35:24, 36:6, 37:1, 41:3, 91:9, 93:4, 109:8 lengths [1] - 85:12 **LESLIE** [1] - 1:5 Letter [2] - 4:6, 4:8 letter [4] - 100:25, 101:15, 101:24, 106:12 letters [3] - 101:23, 103:3, 104:24 level [6] - 44:15, 49:23, 112:14, 112:17, 113:7, 113:9 **liaison** [1] - 12:13 library [1] - 91:16 light [1] - 113:8 likely [4] - 82:9, 82:10, 82:17, 88:18 limited [4] - 80:19, 81:19, 82:12, 85:11 line [47] - 29:17, 29:21, 30:21, 30:22, 30:25, 32:6, 33:14, 33:15, 33:17, 33:20, 33:24, 42:4, 42:6, 42:7, 42:16, 45:2, 49:3, 49:5, 49:6, 50:19, 51:2, 51:5, 51:6, 60:4, 60:12, 60:13, 60:19, 60:20, 60:23, 60:24, 61:1, 62:9, 62:14, 65:18, 65:22, 65:23, 66:20, 97:16, 98:10, 99:14, 112:3 **lined** [1] - 42:18

35:23, 37:18, 38:8, 42:21, 43:23, 45:25, 46:1, 46:3, 47:15, 60:2, 61:2, 62:8, 62:19, 62:20, 63:22, 63:24, 68:16, 74:12, 74:19, 75:1, 75:12, 75:16, 76:2, 78:8, 83:3, 89:23, 106:23, 106:24, 106:25, 107:6 list [1] - 20:18 listed [2] - 16:4, 103:15 listing [1] - 16:20 lists [1] - 16:12 literally [1] - 18:21 live [2] - 40:12, 40:23 lived [1] - 62:1 lives [1] - 40:1 living [2] - 42:18, 42:20 **LLP**[1] - 6:10 local [62] - 23:4, 23:5, 23:8, 25:23, 26:1, 27:8, 27:14, 27:16, 28:1, 29:11, 29:13, 29:18, 30:7, 31:1, 32:2, 38:11, 38:13, 38:15, 41:3, 41:11, 42:19, 42:20, 44:9, 44:11, 45:1, 45:14, 45:18, 47:25, 49:4, 51:22, 52:1, 52:2, 53:14, 53:21, 54:12, 54:13, 54:14, 55:6, 55:10, 55:18, 61:12, 64:6, 66:21, 67:7, 68:24, 69:2, 69:11, 78:17, 86:21, 94:1, 98:25, 107:9, 107:25, 109:5, 111:22, 111:24, 112:7, 112:13, 112:17, 113:7, 113:9 locals [1] - 50:12 located [4] - 28:8, 43:6, 49:12, 63:11 location [1] - 63:25 locations [1] - 98:17 log [2] - 32:3, 47:21 logged [4] - 27:2, 48:7, 48:8, 54:1 login [1] - 27:1 logins [1] - 26:25 look [27] - 10:3, 20:11, 26:2, 28:24, 32:4, 39:7, 42:22,

67:21, 69:13, 80:2, 84:15, 85:17, 85:25, 102:22, 103:20, 105:6, 108:15 looked [2] - 10:5, 57:6 looking [15] - 35:7, 42:22, 42:25, 46:10, 50:18, 60:9, 60:12, 61:3, 69:1, 69:2, 69:6, 73:20, 74:7, 99:19, 102:25 looks [6] - 46:10, 48:23, 60:23, 60:24, 67:7, 67:8 low [1] - 35:16 lower [2] - 63:10, **LR** [67] - 3:16, 22:14, 22:23, 22:24, 23:3, 24:3, 25:13, 25:22, 25:24, 26:5, 26:13, 26:15, 26:16, 26:18, 27:5, 27:6, 28:5, 28:15, 28:19, 29:1, 29:9, 29:19, 30:8, 32:3, 33:7, 37:4, 37:5, 37:20, 37:23, 38:3, 39:24, 40:15, 40:22, 41:2, 41:25, 43:7, 43:23, 44:7, 47:16, 47:22, 48:8, 48:11, 48:15, 50:2, 52:19, 52:22, 53:10, 53:14, 53:20, 54:6, 54:9, 55:3, 59:22, 61:14, 61:15, 65:8, 65:11, 80:21, 81:22, 86:1, 89:15, 98:4, 104:16, 109:5 LRB [14] - 26:17, 27:24, 29:12, 70:15, 74:1, 75:17, 83:15, 87:19, 88:3, 91:10, 91:12, 91:14, 91:20, 106:1 **LT**[1] - 11:12 **LTSB** [33] - 11:15, 11:17, 11:20, 11:23, 11:25, 12:17, 17:3, 25:10, 26:16, 52:5, 59:21, 66:18, 70:14, 73:24, 75:17, 76:19, 77:5, 78:6, 80:19, 81:19, 82:12, 82:15, 82:17, 83:6, 83:15, 86:25, 91:7, 91:11, 91:20, 105:11, 106:1, 108:20, 109:2

6:7

minimum [2] - 16:13,

66:2, 82:23, 103:7, 111:10

M

Madison [6] - 1:20, 5:12, 5:20, 6:4, 6:10, 114:10 mail [2] - 22:10, 84:10 mails [5] - 22:17, 69:24, 75:20, 78:12, 78:14 main [1] - 55:16 Main [14] - 5:11, 5:20, 6:4, 44:21, 55:12, 55:14, 55:15, 55:17, 68:17, 68:18, 68:20, 114:10 **major** [1] - 58:3 **Majority** [1] - 6:11 majority [2] - 35:19, 41:20 manage [1] - 12:20 manager [4] - 12:8, 12:18, 12:19, 88:2 manufacturer [1] -16:6 **MANZANET** [1] - 1:6 map [14] - 3:18, 13:2, 13:3, 22:9, 46:18, 53:4, 59:20, 60:1, 61:11, 64:22, 65:5, 67:5, 67:13, 81:22 mapping [1] - 42:10 maps [24] - 12:10, 22:14, 34:11, 36:10, 36:11, 37:1, 37:2, 46:15, 52:6, 52:10, 52:14, 52:18, 53:16, 54:15, 54:17, 59:12, 67:6, 80:21, 80:23, 81:23, 86:2, 95:5, 98:4, 111:2 March [9] - 19:24, 19:25, 20:2, 27:9, 34:24, 37:17, 53:14, **MARIA** [1] - 6:3 Maria [1] - 102:15 Marie [1] - 101:10 mark [9] - 9:5, 10:12, 23:22, 24:8, 24:9, 58:20, 70:2, 79:5, 99:21 marked [29] - 9:7, 9:16, 10:13, 10:16, 14:10, 14:12, 14:15,

14:22, 20:6, 24:18,

24:24, 25:2, 59:5, 59:9, 70:5, 70:8, 72:18, 73:4, 79:6, 79:9, 79:18, 80:1, 90:7, 94:11, 94:14, 95:19, 99:23, 100:1, 100:15 massive [1] - 42:12 match [7] - 49:23, 86:22, 88:19, 89:19, 89:24, 103:22, 104:9 matched [2] - 49:23, 89:12 materials [6] - 13:25, 58:13, 67:16, 67:25, 90:4. 101:22 matter [4] - 50:5, 55:12, 55:14, 55:18 matters [1] - 114:15 maximum [3] -16:14, 16:15 **MAXINE** [1] - 1:5 McLeod [6] - 8:25, 9:2, 40:3, 40:6, 58:25, 92:1 MCLEOD [1] - 6:9 mCLEOD [1] - 36:16 mean [35] - 18:20, 18:23, 21:21, 29:11, 29:22, 30:1, 31:12, 37:7, 41:5, 46:13, 51:12, 55:3, 55:25, 57:6, 62:4, 69:6, 72:2, 77:7, 77:15, 85:24, 87:25, 88:2, 89:1, 89:4, 89:20, 93:20, 97:7, 99:10, 109:13, 110:16, 111:12, 111:19, 111:25, 113:3 means [2] - 57:8, 113:8 meant [4] - 40:11, 42:17, 68:23, 99:8 measure [2] - 98:14, 98:15 meet [4] - 27:15, 93:6, 93:10, 93:18 meeting [25] - 20:18, 20:19, 23:9, 73:18, 75:17, 75:19, 75:21, 76:16, 83:24, 84:8, 85:6, 85:9, 90:9, 90:13, 92:10, 94:3, 94:4, 96:3, 96:14, 105:8, 105:21, 106:5, 106:8, 106:10 Meeting [2] - 3:21,

4:3

meetings [1] - 85:1

member [1] - 20:18

Members [3] - 1:13, 2:12, 5:4 members [3] - 23:17, 52:23, 93:3 memo [32] - 70:1, 70:17, 70:19, 71:1, 72:24, 77:25, 78:25, 79:1, 79:15, 80:12, 80:16, 80:17, 80:18, 81:4, 81:6, 81:12, 81:19, 82:11, 82:22, 85:3, 96:11, 96:14, 96:23, 96:24, 97:2, 97:5, 98:1, 99:4, 105:25, 106:1, 110:4 Memo [1] - 3:23 Memorandum [1] -3:19 memorandum [8] -3:23, 70:9, 70:14, 74:11, 78:5, 80:5, 96:7, 96:8 memorandums [1] -96:18 memos [4] - 69:22, 70:1, 84:19, 106:23 mention [4] - 9:10, 46:7, 107:17 mentioned [7] - 18:3, 26:12, 33:7, 37:22, 56:6, 106:22, 108:25 merged [2] - 15:11, 26:21 Meridian [2] - 110:8, 110:13 met [3] - 64:15, 92:14, 93:8 meter [1] - 98:20 meters [5] - 58:11, 97:23, 97:24, 98:16, 98:22 **Meyer** [3] - 76:18, 78:16, 84:12 MICHAEL [3] - 1:15, 2:14, 6:10 mid [2] - 96:5, 96:14 mid-November [2] -96:5, 96:14 middle [3] - 86:13, 94:20, 98:3 might [5] - 22:4, 60:25, 84:19, 91:3, 102:12 Mike [1] - 87:18 mile [2] - 50:7, 50:8 Miller [1] - 3:19 miller [4] - 17:24, 83:16, 90:16, 106:7

16:16 minimum/ maximum [1] - 16:24 minus [9] - 58:8, 58:17, 97:18, 97:23, 97:24, 98:16, 98:18, 98:21, 98:22 minute [2] - 11:8, 73:6 minutes [8] - 58:23, 59:11, 72:15, 90:9, 90:13, 94:4, 102:7, 102:11 misalignment [1] -68:2 misquoting [1] -106:13 missing [1] - 18:18 mission [1] - 82:24 misstated [1] - 27:24 misunderstanding [1] - 31:6 modernization [1] -58:3 Monday [1] - 85:9 money [3] - 38:20, 38:21, 42:13 months [1] - 53:16 MOORE [2] - 1:6, morning [2] - 7:7, 7:8 most [5] - 31:15, 53:11, 53:13, 98:15, 112:6 motivation [1] -77:15 mountains [1] -111:12 move [3] - 69:21, 78:23, 113:10 moved [3] - 18:16, 18:20, 18:21 moving [2] - 29:3, 34:4 **MR** [18] - 9:5, 10:11, 36:16, 40:3, 40:6, 58:22, 58:25, 59:2, 67:3, 72:15, 79:4, 87:14, 92:1, 100:9, 100:12, 102:10, 109:22, 113:11 MS [3] - 102:14, 109:20, 113:13 multicolored [3] -60:24, 62:8, 63:24 **multilevel** [1] - 16:19

multiple [3] - 31:8,

31:11, 46:21 municipal [41] -25:24, 26:23, 27:4, 27:17, 28:19, 28:20, 29:6, 29:16, 30:20, 32:5, 38:7, 38:8, 40:9, 42:7, 42:16, 42:21, 45:5, 45:9, 46:1, 52:4, 53:24, 54:8, 55:4, 55:11, 61:13, 61:14, 68:2, 74:10, 80:20, 80:22, 81:21, 81:22, 82:8, 82:15, 89:8, 89:12, 99:9, 99:14, 99:15, 109:6, 110:23 municipalities [8] -28:6, 33:3, 37:10, 38:18, 39:9, 54:16, 88:21, 89:10 municipality [12] -29:18, 30:7, 30:18, 31:1, 32:2, 39:14, 44:12, 45:1, 45:18, 54:1, 55:16, 86:1 **must** [1] - 57:4

Ν

name [7] - 57:9, 74:4, 76:16, 84:14, 84:18, 94:24, 101:3 named [1] - 114:11 nature [1] - 88:2 near [1] - 51:4 necessarily [2] -48:2, 99:18 need [10] - 8:10, 9:10, 9:13, 27:22, 33:12, 33:13, 33:17, 68:16, 108:15, 110:18 needs [2] - 69:16, 111:19 neglected [1] - 17:17 networking [1] - 12:2 never [5] - 7:11, 42:17, 51:13, 87:24, 110:14 new [6] - 18:23, 32:7, 33:18, 54:7, 95:5, 113:4 next [8] - 67:4, 71:17, 76:4, 87:3, 103:18, 105:25, 106:1 NICHOL [2] - 1:15, 2:14 nine [2] - 61:25, 63:16 nominal [1] - 69:15

non [1] - 11:21

Milwaukee [2] - 5:23,

million [1] - 39:18

non-partisan [1] -11:21 nonpartisan [1] -92:25 normally [1] - 110:17 North [2] - 5:23, 6:7 north [1] - 55:14 Nos [2] - 13:18, 99:23 notarial [1] - 115:4 **Notary** [3] - 5:9, 114:4, 115:7 **note** [1] - 23:11 notes [3] - 20:18, 92:10, 94:4 nothing [4] - 21:16, 21:18, 68:7, 114:13 notice [3] - 62:8, 75:19, 76:16 notified [1] - 83:11 **notify** [4] - 83:9, 83:13, 83:23, 106:18 November [11] -38:25, 39:2, 74:11, 78:12, 85:6, 96:5, 96:8, 96:14, 96:23, 97:5 number [52] - 7:25, 10:1, 17:18, 18:1, 18:9, 18:17, 19:23, 20:11, 20:16, 21:2, 21:3, 21:7, 21:15, 21:19, 21:22, 22:8, 22:13, 24:1, 24:2, 24:10, 24:17, 25:15, 32:7, 32:8, 43:5, 43:14, 46:8, 47:2, 49:14. 50:19. 50:20. 50:22, 50:23, 56:15, 56:16, 56:21, 57:18, 58:14, 58:16, 59:24, 59:25, 61:16, 67:18, 67:23, 69:19, 69:21, 72:9, 92:16, 104:17, 107:25 numbered [2] -21:13, 85:22 numbers [12] - 11:3, 16:18, 24:13, 24:14, 24:21, 46:11, 46:12, 57:5, 58:7, 86:6, 86:8 numeral [1] - 19:2 0

o'clock [1] - 113:14 oath [2] - 7:3, 114:16 object [3] - 36:16, 40:3, 40:6

objections [2] - 8:6, 8:8 objective [1] - 82:24 occur [2] - 75:21, 88:16 occurred [2] - 54:4, 105:9 occurs [1] - 113:4 odd [1] - 18:17 **OF** [5] - 1:1, 6:3, 114:1, 114:2 office [2] - 102:16, 103:11 offices [6] - 5:10, 14:3, 17:20, 17:22, 19:21, 114:9 official [5] - 1:14, 2:13, 23:19, 27:8, 38:15 officials [25] - 23:4, 23:9, 25:23, 26:1, 27:8, 27:15, 38:11, 38:14, 41:3, 45:15, 51:23, 52:1, 52:2, 53:15, 53:21, 54:13, 55:6, 55:10, 78:17, 98:25, 109:5, 111:22, 111:24, 112:7 old [1] - 18:25 **OLGA** [1] - 2:9 once [4] - 64:8. 64:15, 93:7, 94:1 one [37] - 7:15, 14:6, 14:10, 17:17, 19:12, 21:5, 21:11, 26:11, 26:25, 30:20, 31:2, 31:4, 33:21, 33:25, 39:23, 48:19, 54:10, 55:1, 60:4, 61:24, 62:6, 63:15, 65:24, 68:23, 76:17, 81:4, 83:9, 84:13, 84:19, 84:20, 84:21, 100:5, 100:15, 108:1 One [4] - 5:11, 5:20, 6:10, 114:10 ones [1] - 45:21 online [3] - 26:19, 26:21, 92:10 open [2] - 21:6, 88:16 operations [3] -92:2, 92:3, 92:4

opinion [1] - 99:18

orange [2] - 60:19,

organization [3] -

91:24, 91:25, 92:23

opportunity [1] -

41:19

60:20

organizations [1] -91:6 organized [1] - 21:15 original [3] - 4:11, 4:24 outlined [3] - 72:4, 74:13, 74:19 outlines [2] - 41:15 output [1] - 39:4 outset [1] - 17:18 outside [3] - 22:1, 63:17, 63:25 overlaid [3] - 39:20, 49:24, 68:23 overlay [1] - 48:2 overlaying [1] -107:12 own [5] - 22:6, 44:23, 49:7, 49:8, 77:15

Ρ

p.m [1] - 113:14 page [21] - 9:23, 24:2, 49:24, 49:25, 60:10, 65:1, 80:18, 81:3, 81:6, 85:15, 85:17, 86:11, 86:13, 88:8, 94:18, 94:20, 95:2, 97:25, 98:2, 98:3 pages [13] - 19:14, 25:6, 25:7, 25:8, 25:9, 25:11, 25:20, 56:18, 56:23, 56:24, 57:2, 64:18. 64:23 Pages [1] - 3:2 paragraph [31] -13:22, 15:15, 17:19, 18:8, 19:23, 20:9, 20:14, 21:13, 25:15, 42:25, 43:3, 43:14, 46:7, 56:15, 56:16, 56:21, 57:18, 65:6, 67:23, 69:19, 69:21, 70:10, 78:24, 79:12, 81:4, 81:8, 81:9, 81:12, 86:18, 88:14, 98.7 paragraphs [5] -11:3, 11:4, 69:20, 85:18, 85:22 parcel [2] - 69:2, 112:4 parcels [1] - 112:8 pardon [1] - 58:15 paren [3] - 88:16,

part [15] - 11:9, 17:10, 26:4, 31:16, 32:9, 39:17, 53:11, 53:13, 62:11, 68:11, 98:15, 104:12, 109:12 particular [7] - 7:16, 11:18, 17:13, 40:16, 42:3, 88:25, 102:2 parties [5] - 8:5, 93:3, 103:11, 114:23, 115:1 partisan [1] - 11:21 parts [1] - 74:17 passed [5] - 32:24, 33:2, 35:21, 36:2, 66:2 password [1] - 27:1 **PAUL** [1] - 2:4 PELLETTER [1] -114:3 Pelletter [2] - 1:21, 5:8 **pending** [2] - 5:5, people [21] - 18:16, 31:14, 40:12, 40:23, 41:6, 46:10, 46:11, 46:12, 49:19, 50:16, 50:20, 54:10, 62:7, 91:5, 102:1, 105:19, 107:18, 110:6, 111:5, 112:2 per [5] - 29:11, 48:7, 66:18, 89:4, 89:25 percent [1] - 55:7 PEREZ [1] - 2:9 perfect [1] - 21:15 perfectly [2] - 48:2, 55:8 perform [8] - 23:2, 23:10, 27:16, 28:1, 38:24, 41:4, 41:11, 82:12 performed [3] -34:12, 34:19 person [4] - 64:5, 107:24, 112:5, 114:12 personally [1] - 13:8 **PETRI** [1] - 2:4 photo [1] - 60:10 physically [1] - 18:21 picture [2] - 66:22, 67:13 piece [1] - 112:9 pilot [2] - 27:7, 27:10 **Pinckney** [1] - 6:10 PL [2] - 19:5, 19:14 place [4] - 27:11, 35:8, 37:14, 52:7

placed [8] - 14:2,

20:17, 22:8, 22:13, 22:22, 69:22, 86:1, 104:20 Plaintiffs [8] - 1:9, 1:11, 2:10, 3:13, 5:3, 5:4, 5:21, 5:24 plaintiffs [2] - 7:15, 10:24 plan [2] - 36:4, 88:11 planning [1] - 90:20 plans [2] - 37:13, 37:19 played [1] - 37:12 **plow** [1] - 44:12 plug [1] - 21:5 plus [9] - 58:7, 58:17, 97:18, 97:23, 97:24, 98:16, 98:18, 98:21, 98:22 point [10] - 8:2, 27:18, 30:9, 56:10, 64:7, 66:1, 77:10, 77:13, 78:5, 94:3 Poland [6] - 3:4, 4:25, 7:6, 7:14, 59:7, 110:2 POLAND [14] - 5:19, 9:5, 10:11, 58:22, 59:2, 70:3, 72:15, 79:4, 87:14, 100:9, 100:12, 102:10, 109:22, 113:11 political [1] - 93:3 population [35] -15:10, 16:13, 16:15, 16:16, 40:11, 40:13, 40:21, 44:8, 44:10, 45:7, 45:20, 45:22, 46:20, 46:22, 46:25, 47:23, 49:15, 54:8, 66:15, 68:1, 68:5, 68:9, 68:13, 68:21, 68:25, 69:1, 69:3, 69:10, 69:17, 74:15, 76:5, 76:24, 78:9 Porter [1] - 6:15 portion [1] - 59:20 posed [1] - 77:6 position [1] - 11:9 positional [1] - 97:18 possession [3] -21:23, 22:2, 22:6 possibility [1] -30:20 **possible** [1] - 110:8 post [1] - 52:14 potential [2] - 39:21, 56:8 potentially [3] - 47:3, 68:6, 84:20

parens [1] - 95:5

88:17, 95:6

VIDEO
PowerPoint rea
PowerPoint [2] -
57:19, 67:18
pre [1] - 88:17
pre-spring [1] -
88:17
precisely [1] - 86:23
predicate [1] - 30:4
premise [2] - 89:3,
89:6
premises [1] - 99:16
•
preparation [1] -
70:17
prepared [7] - 36:12,
36:14, 65:2, 70:19,
73:15, 73:18, 73:22
prescribed [2] -
88:19, 89:19
present [2] - 6:15,
84:25
presumption [1] -
108:22
pretty [11] - 17:11,
19:3, 31:12, 39:6,
44:18, 50:22, 69:15,
89:20, 110:15, 111:1,
111:21
previous [1] - 95:19
previously [2] -
32:11, 105:5
primarily [2] - 31:12,
35:17
Prime [1] - 110:8
prime [1] - 110:13
printed [1] - 59:13
problem [12] - 43:19,
47:5, 48:3, 77:17,
77:20, 82:18, 82:25,
83:7, 107:12, 108:13,
110:5
problems [4] - 70:24,
71:2, 97:4, 113:6
procedure [3] - 7:19,
32:21, 103:10
proceeding [1] -
91:1
process [27] - 17:10,
19:18, 23:6, 28:6,
34:1, 34:12, 34:18,
34:21, 34:23, 35:10,
36:15, 36:25, 37:10,
47:16, 54:14, 54:16,
58:3, 74:9, 89:13,
90:18, 90:19, 91:4,
93:19, 110:16,
111:10, 113:2
procured [1] - 45:13
produce [2] - 24:15,
52:14
produced [8] -
10:20, 10:23, 23:15,

58:13, 59:20, 73:1, 90:4, 103:22 **Produced** [1] - 3:12 production [2] -23:20, 103:1 Professional [4] -1:22, 5:9, 114:4, 115:8 program [2] - 12:15, 27:7 progressively [1] -60:6 prohibition [2] -87:6, 87:11 project [3] - 27:6, 27:21, 39:17 projected [1] - 39:19 pronounced [1] -74:5 **proposed** [1] - 93:25 proprietary [1] -111:3 Prospect [1] - 5:23 provide [7] - 12:9, 12:21, 12:25, 19:21, 67:25, 91:17, 102:2 provided [9] - 4:11, 13:25, 29:2, 56:12, 56:22, 67:16, 84:16, 104:23, 109:7 proximity [1] - 50:18 Public [4] - 5:9, 15:9, 114:4, 115:7 public [6] - 12:12, 12:24, 13:1, 26:20, 91:19, 112:22 published [3] -52:13, 52:16, 53:18 Puerto [1] - 42:11 **pull** [1] - 102:24 purchased [1] - 16:2

purple [1] - 60:24

pursuant [3] - 5:7,

24:14, 30:7, 30:8,

52:7, 53:18, 55:5,

35:8, 37:13, 38:21,

72:12, 96:18, 103:14,

107:7, 108:8, 108:17

putting [4] - 99:11,

107:18, 110:5, 110:6

17:1, 92:21

7:18, 114:6

purpose [4] - 18:15, 27:12, 27:14, 36:12 purposes [3] - 8:1, put [17] - 15:4, 17:8,

Q

qualified [1] - 114:5 Questions [1] - 3:21 questions [23] -7:20, 7:22, 8:7, 8:10, 8:18, 13:6, 22:9, 47:13, 72:3, 72:5, 72:7, 72:25, 73:5, 73:9, 77:6, 100:4, 102:17, 105:7, 109:18, 109:21, 109:23, 113:12 quick [1] - 67:18 quite [10] - 38:8, 53:22, 57:8, 58:5, 58:6, 58:9, 84:6, 96:17, 97:21, 113:3

R

raised [2] - 55:20, 96:13 **RAMIREZ** [1] - 2:9 **RAMIRO** [1] - 2:9 range [3] - 40:11, 50:6, 50:11 rare [1] - 55:4 rather [1] - 34:13 raw [1] - 29:20 **RE** [1] - 110:1 **RE-EXAMINATION** [1] - 110:1 read [7] - 13:22, 19:3, 20:12, 81:1, 87:15, 87:16, 96:20 reading [8] - 62:24, 80:25, 81:1, 82:4, 85:11, 97:25, 98:8, 114:20 reads [1] - 87:3 reality [4] - 45:4, 45:18, 49:8, 51:25 really [11] - 13:13, 29:22, 37:6, 49:1, 54:21, 68:20, 72:7, 77:18, 84:24, 96:16, 112:8 reason [4] - 8:14, 68:23, 68:24, 88:4 reasons [1] - 24:17 reassign [1] - 33:23 reassigned [1] recalling [1] - 110:11 receive [2] - 74:22, 76:9

39:16, 78:12 **Recess** [4] - 59:4, 72:17, 100:11, 102:13 recipients [1] - 84:11 recollection [1] -84:11 record [12] - 9:18, 20:12, 23:24, 59:1, 59:3, 70:12, 79:5, 100:10, 100:13, 100:21, 102:11, 114:19 records [1] - 39:18 recovery [1] - 13:5 red [4] - 60:4, 60:12, 60:13, 62:9 redistricting [43] -12:13, 12:14, 13:9, 13:12, 14:2, 15:8, 15:9, 15:10, 15:23, 17:10, 17:13, 20:17, 23:5, 27:16, 28:2, 29:14, 32:10, 32:18, 32:22, 34:9, 34:25, 36:24, 40:18, 41:11, 41:12, 54:14, 57:20, 90:14, 90:18, 91:4, 91:21, 92:20, 93:19, 94:2, 95:5, 109:1, 109:3, 109:9, 109:10, 109:17, 111:8, 112:15, 112:20 Redistricting [2] -3:21, 4:3 reduced [1] - 114:17 refer [1] - 24:20 reference [11] - 17:7, 41:10, 42:23, 44:1, 58:17, 91:15, 95:3, 97:15, 110:4, 110:15 referenced [1] - 42:2 referencing [4] -63:7, 85:24, 97:17, 107:3 referred [1] - 72:24 referring [8] - 11:18, 14:4, 24:20, 25:14, 49:14, 58:1, 59:12, 8:08 refers [1] - 79:15 reflect [1] - 23:24 regarding [3] - 3:23, 105:6, 109:2 Regardless [1] -88:15 regards [1] - 111:16 Registered [4] -1:22, 5:8, 114:3, 115:8

34:23, 37:20, 38:5, registered [17] -43:5, 43:12, 43:15, 46:8, 49:9, 49:16, 49:17, 50:3, 50:15, 56:6, 56:8, 61:20, 66:11, 66:14, 71:9, 71:14, 85:25 registration [2] -39:15 **REID** [1] - 2:5 **REINHART** [1] - 6:6 relate [2] - 80:23, 81:23 related [7] - 12:4, 22:10, 22:17, 23:4, 67:25, 69:24, 114:22 relative [1] - 114:25 release [3] - 27:9, 52:13, 52:22 released [2] - 53:14, 53:20 remember [5] -35:20, 37:1, 76:15, 84:14, 110:3 rephrase [1] - 8:17 report [6] - 16:11, 16:22, 16:23, 18:11, 18:12, 18:14 reported [1] - 82:18 Reporter [4] - 1:22, 5:9, 114:4, 115:8 reporter [4] - 7:20, 10:15, 79:8, 82:2 REPORTER [1] reporting [1] - 83:8 reports [17] - 14:3, 15:20, 15:21, 15:24, 15:25, 16:1, 16:3, 16:5, 16:10, 17:2, 17:6, 17:8, 17:9, 17:14, 17:15, 17:19, 18:10 represent [4] - 7:15, 61:19, 66:11, 69:1 representation [4] -60:21, 75:25, 76:1, 77:3 representative [2] -17:24, 17:25 represented [4] -8:21, 65:5, 65:21, 97:2 request [10] - 13:4, 13:24, 14:8, 15:3, 15:6, 21:16, 21:20, 68:8, 91:20, 92:6 requested [3] - 17:2, 17:4, 103:11

requests [2] - 13:2,

received [6] - 28:16,

	/ = = = . · · · · · · ·			_, . ,
41:7	RONALD [2] - 1:3,	85:18, 85:19, 86:15,	shapefiles [1] -	South [1] - 6:10
require [1] - 87:4	1:10	86:17, 86:20, 86:23,	98:11	spatial [4] - 42:8,
required [1] - 41:18	Ross [2] - 75:4,	87:7, 88:10, 88:11,	shared [2] - 51:13,	42:14, 58:4, 58:5
requirements [1] -	84:12	88:21, 94:19, 94:22,	51:14	spatially [5] - 38:13,
27:15	RPR [1] - 1:21	94:24, 95:1, 95:2,	sharp [1] - 79:23	38:16, 38:22, 45:15,
requires [1] - 90:19	RSWG [5] - 20:19,	95:7, 95:25, 96:2,	SHEILA [1] - 1:4	48:23
rescue [1] - 44:13	21:3, 21:11, 90:13,	96:11, 100:5, 113:6	shift [1] - 68:22	Speaker [1] - 6:12
resolving [1] - 96:22	90:15	seeing [1] - 67:13	shifted [3] - 55:14,	speaking [4] - 41:24,
respect [2] - 31:25,	rule [1] - 94:22	seeks [2] - 78:25,	55:15, 55:18	57:24, 96:9, 96:10
59:17	Rule [1] - 4:5	80:16	show [3] - 23:21,	specific [4] - 21:12,
respective [1] - 68:5	rules [1] - 7:14	select [1] - 54:7	58:19, 67:6	40:9, 46:11, 96:24
responded [1] -	run [2] - 11:7, 15:3	selected [1] - 15:22	showing [1] - 111:5	specifically [3] -
77:13	running [3] - 30:22,	selection [1] - 65:4	shows [2] - 57:20	16:10, 74:14, 76:14
Response [1] - 3:12	30:25, 32:6	Senate [1] - 6:11	sick [1] - 85:7	Specifically [1] -
response [16] - 3:15,	RYAN [1] - 2:4	senate [7] - 16:11,	side [10] - 30:24,	76:4
10:20, 10:23, 11:4,		16:12, 16:17, 16:23,	30:25, 31:4, 31:5,	specifications [1] -
20:16, 21:13, 21:16,	S	18:17, 82:17, 104:15	54:10, 57:14, 78:20,	48:5
25:15, 57:16, 68:7,	•	Senator [2] - 17:24,	90:2, 94:9, 95:17	specify [1] - 26:23
68:12, 69:22, 70:10,		17:25	signature [1] - 101:2	speculate [2] - 22:3,
76:9, 76:11, 80:9	S.C [4] - 5:11, 5:19,	send [3] - 101:9,	signed [2] - 104:21,	35:12
responses [2] - 15:4,	6:6, 114:9	101:20, 106:14	105:2	split [15] - 29:20,
69:20	SANCHEZ [1] - 1:7	sense [2] - 33:13,	signing [1] - 114:20	29:22, 29:23, 30:16,
responsible [1] -	SANCHEZ-BELL [1]	34:10	similar [3] - 38:12,	30:17, 31:2, 31:3,
22:5	- 1:7	SENSENBRENNER	92:18, 92:20	33:12, 46:21, 46:23,
responsive [2] -	Sarah [5] - 1:21, 5:8,	[1] - 2:4	simply [1] - 82:25	47:1, 53:24, 87:21,
20:14, 72:9	76:15, 78:16, 84:12	sent [8] - 7:17, 9:3,	single [1] - 15:16	87:24, 88:3
rest [2] - 56:12,	SARAH [1] - 114:3	100:25, 101:14,	sitting [1] - 7:21	splitting [5] - 29:25,
56:25	saw [4] - 55:19,	103:4, 103:7, 106:2,	situations [1] - 31:10	87:4, 87:6, 87:10,
restate [1] - 8:16	96:11, 110:3, 110:4	106:12	six [4] - 50:7, 61:25,	87:11
result [6] - 31:25,	SCHLIEPP [1] - 1:7	sentence [5] - 71:17,	63:16	spot [1] - 112:2
39:4, 46:17, 108:8,	school [1] - 112:10	71:20, 87:3, 88:14,	slow [1] - 82:1	spring [1] - 88:17
108:17, 110:7	scope [7] - 66:5,	88:15	small [1] - 83:10	square [2] - 50:12,
results [4] - 22:16,	77:16, 77:20, 82:18,	sentences [1] - 71:6	smaller [1] - 38:19	50:13
39:11, 111:1, 111:4	83:8, 83:12, 106:17	separate [3] - 22:23,	snapshots [1] - 29:4	squares [2] - 50:8,
revise [1] - 12:10	Scott [1] - 6:12	39:17, 107:10	software [11] - 15:22,	50:13
RIBBLE [1] - 2:5	se [5] - 29:11, 48:7,	September [5] -	16:2, 16:6, 16:7,	ss [1] - 114:1
RICHARD [2] - 1:6	66:18, 89:4, 89:25	29:5, 29:15, 33:3,	16:22, 41:8, 41:18,	stack [1] - 58:13
Rico [1] - 42:11	seal [1] - 115:4	37:12, 55:7	109:8, 109:16, 111:3	stacked [1] - 62:5
right-hand [2] -	sealed [1] - 104:21	sequential [1] - 32:8	solid [6] - 60:4,	Staff [2] - 3:22, 4:3
63:10, 80:2	SEAN [1] - 2:5	servers [1] - 12:2	60:12, 60:13, 62:9,	staff [8] - 12:11,
RISSEEUW [1] - 1:7	second [12] - 19:12,	service [1] - 11:21	62:13, 62:14	12:23, 20:17, 74:8,
RMD [1] - 2:12	26:11, 39:2, 39:23,	Services [1] - 11:13	someone [4] - 13:3,	84:21, 90:14, 91:21,
road [7] - 42:11,	65:1, 65:10, 68:11,	set [12] - 11:3, 13:23,	66:17, 89:16, 108:17	109:19
48:21, 57:20, 58:19,	75:24, 86:18, 94:18,	31:23, 40:22, 57:14,	someplace [1] -	stand [1] - 53:9
62:17, 62:23, 93:11	98:7, 100:10	78:20, 81:12, 90:2,	110:4	standalone [1] -
roads [1] - 62:22	section [3] - 65:4,	94:8, 95:17, 110:20,	sometime [11] -	22:24
ROBSON [1] - 1:7	86:13, 86:18	115:3	19:24, 27:9, 34:24,	standard [4] - 12:10,
ROCHELLE [1] - 1:6	sections [1] - 65:21	setting [1] - 109:9	34:25, 38:25, 51:16,	13:2, 17:11, 110:16
rock [1] - 22:10	see [56] - 9:24,	seven [3] - 61:25,	52:17, 53:20, 75:22,	standardized [2] -
Rock [4] - 60:22,	10:25, 18:16, 18:18,	63:16, 92:17	92:7, 92:11	39:19, 49:21
61:6, 61:12, 62:3	20:24, 21:3, 21:5,	several [7] - 11:25,	somewhere [3] -	standpoint [1] -
ROGERS [1] - 1:7	21:10, 23:11, 28:24,	25:7, 29:3, 53:16,	20:1, 73:17, 92:12	111:10
role [5] - 11:24,	31:6, 32:5, 38:6, 42:1,	55:25, 92:16, 97:15	soon [1] - 52:12	staple [1] - 79:23
12:16, 66:1, 66:2,	42:3, 42:5, 47:7,	shaded [6] - 46:19,	sorry [9] - 37:6, 40:6,	start [5] - 36:24,
109:4	49:16, 58:19, 59:24,	59:13, 61:9, 61:11,	73:13, 75:5, 80:25,	50:18, 100:19,
Roman [2] - 18:8,	60:4, 60:19, 60:23,	61:17, 64:8	81:1, 81:16, 81:25,	102:21, 108:19
19:2	63:8, 67:3, 71:10,	Shane [3] - 84:23,	82:3	started [4] - 27:6,
RON [1] - 1:4	71:19, 74:20, 75:25,	84:25	sort [2] - 7:13, 56:7	34:21, 92:11, 94:2
Ronald [4] - 4:6,	76:7, 77:2, 79:2,	shapefile [4] - 19:15,	sounds [1] - 84:24	starting [1] - 27:18
100:6, 100:24, 101:7	79:25, 80:3, 80:5,	80:23, 81:23, 97:16	south [1] - 55:15	state [10] - 11:10,
		4.0		

41 of 43 sheets 2:11-cwww.fr.ForFherecordinal_12_3w1comage 4(608) 8390392ent 173 ge 12 to 12 of 14

14:1, 20:16, 22:13, 26:23, 29:14, 33:11, 43:3, 50:7, 57:18 **State** [6] - 5:10, 5:13, 6:11, 114:5, 114:11, 115:7 **STATE** [2] - 6:3, 114:1 statement [6] - 40:8, 71:8, 71:11, 87:3, 88:25, 89:4 statements [2] -85:21, 99:3 States [2] - 5:6, 42:10 states [7] - 10:22, 71:17, 80:18, 81:18, 86:14, 86:20, 88:15 **STATES** [1] - 1:1 Statewide [6] - 15:7, 28:9, 28:11, 104:1, 104:10 **statewide** [1] - 28:20 stating [1] - 82:22 statistical [1] - 99:8 statistics [1] - 99:15 statute [3] - 36:3, 53:23, 87:17 statutes [6] - 27:21, 35:8, 36:5, 40:10, 40:19, 91:18 **statutory** [2] - 27:15, step [2] - 53:19, 67:4 Steve [4] - 3:19, 83:16, 90:16, 106:7 **still** [7] - 33:8, 33:10, 33:12, 49:6, 55:15, 96:15 stop [1] - 26:9 straightforward [1] -39:7 Street [18] - 5:12, 5:20, 6:4, 6:7, 6:10, 44:21, 55:12, 55:14, 55:15, 55:16, 55:17, 68:17, 68:18, 68:20, 114:10 **street** [3] - 44:21, 110:22 streets [2] - 44:13, 47:23 strictly [3] - 88:19, 89:18, 89:23 strike [3] - 33:6, 34:7, 96:12 **structure** [1] - 14:7 studied [1] - 96:21 stuff [4] - 17:11,

35:14, 84:1, 113:4

subject [1] - 13:12 submitted [5] -28:23, 43:8, 44:2, 47:19, 51:18 subparagraphs [1] -69:25 Subpoena [2] - 3:11, 3:13 subpoena [13] -3:15, 5:7, 7:17, 7:18, 9:2, 9:19, 10:21, 10:23, 11:5, 14:8, 25:17, 80:9, 114:7 **subsets** [1] - 51:7 **Suite** [5] - 5:20, 5:23, 6:7, 6:10, 6:16 summarize [3] -25:20, 47:6, 82:21 supervisory [1] -27:3 Supplement [1] - 4:5 supplement [1] -94:21 **supply** [1] - 109:15 supplying [1] -111:18 **support** [4] - 12:3, 12:21, 12:25, 109:8 **supposed** [1] - 29:4 SVRS [5] - 86:22, 87:1, 111:17, 111:19, 112:24 sworn [2] - 7:2, 114:13 system [9] - 17:8, 17:16, 38:22, 39:15, 78:18, 107:3, 108:13, 111:18, 112:25 System [1] - 12:7 systems [2] - 48:4, 109:9

Т

table [2] - 16:18, 16:25 tabulated [1] - 99:12 TAMMY [1] - 1:10 target [2] - 29:3, 58:5 team [7] - 12:1, 12:5, 12:8, 12:21, 13:8 teams [1] - 11:25 Tech [2] - 19:14, 19:15 technical [13] -11:21, 12:3, 12:21, 78:13, 88:2, 90:17, 97:17, 97:20, 109:8, 109:11, 109:14,

112:25, 113:5 technically [3] -30:17, 88:5, 91:9 technicians [1] -44:19 Technology [1] -11:13 telephone [1] - 5:24 template [2] - 17:2, 18:10 templates [1] - 18:10 ten [6] - 41:5, 61:25, 92:18, 98:21, 111:15, 111:20 term [6] - 11:17, 18:20, 39:11, 49:18, 55:19, 61:5 terms [1] - 55:25 terrific [2] - 15:2, 92:6 testified [4] - 7:3, 13:7, 82:23, 105:5 **Testify** [1] - 3:11 testify [2] - 95:12, 114:13 testifying [3] - 7:18, 91:13, 95:9 testimony [2] -28:14, 114:19 Thanksgiving [1] -39:3 THE [1] - 8:23 themselves [2] -53:1, 83:20 thereupon [1] -114:16 they've [3] - 84:4, 84:6, 112:25 thinking [1] - 97:3 third [6] - 9:22, 19:25, 27:9, 81:8, 81:9, 105:1 **THOMAS** [5] - 1:15, 1:16, 2:4, 2:14, 2:15 thousands [1] - 69:8 three [8] - 12:20, 14:23, 61:24, 63:15, 81:4, 103:14, 104:23 **Thumb** [1] - 3:15 thumb [11] - 14:6, 14:10, 14:14, 14:16, 14:19, 14:23, 15:5, 15:17, 20:5, 20:8, 21:1 THYSSEN [1] - 1:8 **tie** [1] - 64:22 tied [3] - 40:20,

55:21, 55:23, 55:24, 55:25, 56:1, 56:2, 57:22, 97:8, 97:16, 98:4, 98:10, 98:11, 106:22, 106:24, 106:25, 107:1, 110:20, 110:21, 110:24, 110:25 timing [1] - 29:9 **TIMOTHY** [2] - 1:16, title [2] - 12:16, 94:20 today [16] - 7:18, 8:6, 8:21, 8:25, 9:11, 9:20, 10:8, 13:12, 13:20, 14:17, 53:9, 73:1, 82:23, 90:5, 99:21, 103:21 together [12] - 15:11, 30:19, 41:9, 42:18, 49:5, 49:7, 64:22, 64:23, 92:23, 99:12, 107:13, 112:13 tomorrow [1] - 57:11 **TONY** [3] - 3:3, 5:1, 114:12 tONY [2] - 1:19, 7:1 Tony [5] - 3:13, 4:7, 4:8, 6:12, 10:24 took [8] - 26:4, 26:19, 27:10, 39:7, 39:12, 67:18, 72:20 tool [1] - 41:2 top [3] - 10:22, 62:5, 69:7 topic [1] - 95:3 topics [2] - 96:6, 96:7 topologically [1] -107:2 tossed [1] - 58:7 total [5] - 45:7, 68:1, 68:9, 68:13, 69:1 totals [14] - 15:10, 16:13, 40:14, 44:8, 44:10, 45:7, 45:22, 68:25, 69:4, 69:17, 74:15, 76:5, 76:24, 78:9 touching [1] - 114:14 toward [1] - 85:17 towards [1] - 102:4 town [5] - 60:15, 60:17, 60:21, 61:7, 62:2 township [2] - 50:6, 50:10

training [1] - 21:11

transcribed [1] - 8:4

4:24 transcription [1] -114:18 translate [2] - 47:24, 48:14 TRAVIS [1] - 1:8 trial [4] - 8:1, 8:2, 95:10, 95:12 tried [5] - 23:5, 42:5, 42:14, 42:15, 66:5 **true** [1] - 114:19 truth [2] - 114:13, 114:14 try [6] - 22:21, 43:12, 47:6, 59:16, 98:19, 113:1 trying [11] - 37:9, 47:9, 47:11, 49:10, 54:21, 64:22, 66:19, 71:4, 78:7, 78:13, 78:17 turn [5] - 9:22, 49:24, 85:14, 94:18, 95:2 turning [3] - 48:25, 57:15, 85:2 two [50] - 19:6, 21:10, 25:6, 25:11, 25:20, 26:2, 26:4, 27:7, 28:24, 28:25, 31:3, 33:21, 33:22, 39:7, 48:1, 49:20, 56:4, 56:18, 56:23, 56:24, 58:22, 61:24, 62:25, 63:8, 63:15, 63:21, 64:18, 64:23, 65:18, 65:20, 66:9, 66:10, 67:6, 68:22, 69:22, 69:25, 71:5, 72:15, 74:17, 75:23, 77:6, 78:20, 80:11, 81:4, 83:9, 100:14, 104:23, 107:8, 107:13 type [8] - 35:13, 45:6, 48:9, 50:25, 51:20, 51:24, 82:2, 112:4 **types** [1] - 17:9 typewriting [1] -114:17 **typical** [1] - 50:22 typically [2] - 17:9, typing [3] - 107:25, 108:11, 108:12 U

transcript [2] - 4:11,

U.S [6] - 12:14, 27:3,

TIGER [25] - 15:11,

19:15, 19:16, 55:17,

44:10, 68:25

56:1, 57:21, 69:4, 99:7 under [14] - 15:6, 15:20, 17:18, 43:23, 53:2, 55:1, 56:3, 66:13, 71:25, 86:18, 87:17, 87:25, 104:1 underlying [3] -46:20, 108:2, 111:2 underneath [1] -33:23 understood [5] - 8:3, 66:22, 67:14, 88:7, 106:17 unit [1] - 12:3 **UNITED** [1] - 1:1 **United** [2] - 5:6, 42:10 University [1] - 26:17 unless [3] - 8:8, 34:2, 87:21 **up** [27] - 21:6, 26:11, 26:16, 34:4, 39:17, 39:23, 42:18, 45:2, 46:16, 48:18, 48:25, 49:5, 55:10, 56:17, 61:16, 67:6, 75:25, 77:5, 86:6, 87:23, 99:13, 99:14, 102:17, 102:24, 109:9, 111:5, 111:7 updated [3] - 33:8, 33:10, 35:5 updating [1] - 29:7 user [1] - 108:4 uses [1] - 44:12

V

vague [1] - 36:18 VAN [6] - 1:19, 3:3, 5:1, 6:6, 7:1, 114:12 **Van** [22] - 3:13, 4:7, 4:8, 6:12, 7:7, 9:15, 10:15, 10:24, 14:14, 24:12, 25:1, 59:8, 70:7, 72:20, 79:8, 90:3, 94:13, 95:22, 99:25, 100:7, 100:14, 102:14 **VARA**[1] - 2:9 various [2] - 108:14, 108:15 **VERA**[1] - 1:4 versus [3] - 34:10, 111:8, 111:24 Video [1] - 6:15 videographer [1] -7:23

VIDEOTAPE [2] -1:18, 5:1 videotaping [1] -7:24 visual [1] - 77:2 Voces [1] - 5:24 **VOCES** [1] - 2:8 **VOCKE** [2] - 1:16, 2:15 vote [1] - 40:12 voted [2] - 112:2, 112:5 voter [10] - 39:14, 39:15, 39:16, 40:1, 47:4, 50:14, 65:4, 71:9, 71:14, 71:18 voters [35] - 39:21, 40:16, 43:5, 43:13, 43:15, 46:8, 47:2, 48:24, 49:9, 49:16, 49:17, 50:3, 50:15, 51:3, 56:7, 56:8, 61:20, 62:1, 63:1, 65:6, 65:10, 65:24, 66:11, 66:15, 71:23, 71:25, 82:7, 82:14, 82:16, 83:10, 85:25, 86:5, 105:12, 110:7 votes [1] - 33:24 voting [4] - 33:21, 88:21, 89:8, 89:12

W

waived [1] - 114:20 **WARA** [1] - 2:9 ward [31] - 23:6, 25:24, 28:2, 28:3, 29:16, 29:20, 29:25, 30:16, 30:17, 31:2, 31:3, 31:15, 31:24, 32:5, 32:7, 33:19, 33:21, 34:16, 35:3, 35:5, 36:22, 37:9, 37:18, 47:15, 47:22, 47:23, 48:10, 48:11, 78:13, 104:15, 109:6 wards [29] - 27:4, 27:12, 27:17, 27:18, 27:22, 28:19, 28:20, 30:6, 30:9, 30:20, 31:7, 31:16, 31:18, 33:4, 33:11, 34:13, 35:11, 36:24, 37:4, 37:11, 37:20, 38:7, 40:9, 44:7, 45:6, 45:9, 48:8, 53:23 Water [1] - 6:7 ways [1] - 52:3

website [1] - 52:15 week [6] - 19:25, 23:16, 27:9, 39:2, 73:16, 75:23 West [1] - 6:4 wherein [1] - 5:3 whereof [1] - 115:3 Whitewater [1] - 54:3 Whitt [3] - 76:15, 78:16, 84:12 whole [3] - 54:14, 67:13, 94:2 **WI** [1] - 6:16 **WIELEN** [5] - 1:19, 3:3, 5:1, 7:1, 114:12 Wielen [22] - 3:13, 4:7, 4:8, 6:13, 7:7, 9:15, 10:15, 10:24, 14:14, 24:12, 25:1, 59:8, 70:7, 72:20, 79:8, 90:3, 94:13, 95:23, 99:25, 100:7, 100:14, 102:14 WISCONSIN [3] -1:1, 6:3, 114:1 Wisconsin [34] -1:13, 1:20, 2:1, 2:12, 2:16, 4:3, 5:4, 5:7, 5:10, 5:13, 5:20, 5:23, 6:4, 6:7, 6:11, 6:11, 6:12, 11:22, 12:2, 26:17, 27:20, 32:10, 32:18, 40:1, 50:6, 57:19, 74:13, 74:19, 91:4, 95:6, 104:14, 114:6, 114:11, 115:7 **WISE** [68] - 3:16, 22:14, 22:23, 22:24, 23:3, 24:3, 25:13, 25:22, 25:24, 26:5, 26:13, 26:15, 26:16, 26:18, 27:5, 27:6, 28:5, 28:15, 28:19, 29:1, 29:9, 29:19, 30:8, 32:3, 33:7, 37:4, 37:5, 37:20, 37:23, 38:3, 39:24, 40:15, 40:22, 41:2, 41:25, 43:7, 43:23, 44:7, 47:16, 47:22, 48:8, 48:11, 48:15, 50:2, 52:19, 52:22, 53:10,

23:3, 24:3, 25:13, 25:22, 25:24, 26:5, 26:13, 26:15, 26:16, 26:18, 27:5, 27:6, 28:5, 28:15, 28:19, 29:1, 29:9, 29:19, 30:8, 32:3, 33:7, 37:4, 37:5, 37:20, 37:23, 38:3, 39:24, 40:15, 40:22, 41:2, 41:25, 43:7, 43:23, 44:7, 47:16, 47:22, 48:8, 48:11, 48:15, 50:2, 52:19, 52:22, 53:10, 53:14, 53:20, 54:6, 54:9, 55:3, 59:22, 61:14, 61:15, 65:8, 65:11, 80:21, 81:22, 86:1, 89:15, 98:4, 104:16, 109:5 wit [1] - 114:12 WITNESS [2] - 8:23, 72:16 Witness [1] - 3:2 witness [7] - 5:2, 7:2, 23:25, 57:10, 91:12, 114:19, 115:3 wondering [1] - 97:1 word [2] - 33:12, 34:3 words [2] - 33:16, 82:21 workstations [1] -34:25 world [3] - 42:19, 42:20, 49:8 worlds [1] - 107:10 write [1] - 43:1 written [4] - 74:4, 74:8, 78:6, 103:4 wrote [2] - 105:25, 106:1

Υ

year [1] - 27:10 years [6] - 27:7, 41:6, 92:18, 98:21, 111:15, 111:21 Ylvisaker [5] - 3:20, 74:3, 83:16, 90:17, 106:7 ylvisaker [1] - 74:4

Ζ

zone [3] - 39:10, 65:12, 65:23 **zones** [4] - 39:12,

50:16, 50:17, 65:16 **zoomed** [1] - 60:6

WISE-LR [67] - 3:16,

22:14, 22:23, 22:24,

53:14, 53:20, 54:6,

61:14, 61:15, 65:8,

86:1, 89:15, 98:4,

104:16, 109:5

65:11, 80:21, 81:22,

54:9, 55:3, 59:22,